THE TRUE

INTEREST OF AMERICA

IMPARTIALLY STATED,

IN CERTAIN

STRICTURES

ON A PAMPHLET INTITLED

COMMON SENSE.

BY AN AMERICAN.

" You have been told that we are ſeditious, impatient of go-
" vernment, and deſirous of Independency. Be aſſured that
" theſe are not *Facts*, but *Calumnies*— Permit us to be as free as
" yourſelves, and we ſhall ever eſteem a union with you to be our
" *greateſt glory* and our *greateſt happineſs*.—Place us in the ſame
" ſituation we were at the cloſe of the laſt war, and our *former*
" *harmony* will be reſtored." CONTINENTAL CONGRESS's
Addreſs to the People of Great-Britain.

" Obtrectatio et livor pronis auribus accipiuntur." TACITUS.

" ——Nihil eſt, Antipho,
" Quin mali narrando poſſit depravarier." TERENCE.

THE SECOND EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA.

PRINTED AND SOLD BY JAMES HUMPHREYS, junr.
The Corner of Black horſe Alley Front-ſtreet.

M,DCC,LXXVI.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO ALL
SINCERE LOVERS
OF
PEACE AND TRUTH;
TO ALL WHO WISH FOR THE
HAPPINESS AND PROSPERITY
OF
AMERICA;
AND TO ALL THE
DISPASSIONATE, JUDICIOUS,
AND
REAL FRIENDS
OF
CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY;
THE FOLLOWING STRICTURES
ARE HUMBLY INSCRIBED
BY THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THE *following pages contain an anſwer to one of the moſt artful, inſidious and pernicious pamphlets I have ever met with. It is addreſſed to the paſſions of the populace, at a time when their paſſions are much inflamed. At ſuch junctures, cool reaſon and judgment are too apt to ſleep: The mind is eaſily impoſed on, and the moſt violent meaſures will,* therefore *be thought the moſt ſalutary. Poſitive aſſertions will paſs for demonſtration with many, rage for ſincerity and the moſt glaring abſurdities and falſhoods will be ſwallowed.*

The author of COMMON SENSE, *has availed himſelf of all theſe circumſtances. Under the maſk of friendſhip to America, in the preſent calamitous ſituation of affairs, he gives vent to his own private reſentment and ambition, and recommends a ſcheme which muſt infallibly prove ruinous. He propoſes that we ſhould renounce our allegiance to our Sovereign, break off all connection with Great-Britain, and ſet up an independent empire of the republican kind. Senſible that ſuch a propoſal muſt, even at this time, be ſhocking to the ears of Americans; he inſinuates that the* novelty *of his ſentiments is the only* obſtacle *to their* ſucceſs — *that, "perhaps they are not yet ſufficiently faſhionable to "procure them general favour; that a long habit of not "thinking a thing wrong, gives it a ſuperficial appearance "of being right, and raiſes at firſt a formidable outcry in "defence of cuſtom."*

In this he imitates all other enthuſiaſts and viſionary aſſertors of paradoxes, who were conſcious that the common feelings of mankind muſt revolt againſt their ſchemes: The author, however, though he did not intend it here, pays a compliment to the Americans; for this amounts to a confeſſion that amidſt all their grievances, they ſtill retain their allegiance and loyalty.

With

With the ſame view, I preſume, to make his pamphlet go down the better, he preſixes the title of Common Senſe *to it—by a figure in rhetoric, which is called a* Catachreſis, *that is, in plain Engliſh, an abuſe of words. Under this title, he counteracts the cleareſt dictates of reaſon, truth, and common ſenſe, Thus have I ſeen a book written by a popiſh bigot, entitled,* Mercy and Truth; or, Charity maintained; *in which the author very devoutly and charitably damns all heretics.*

I find no Common Senſe *in this pamphlet, but much* uncommon *phrenzy. It is an outrageous inſult on the common ſenſe of Americans; an inſidious attempt to poiſon their minds, and ſeduce them from their loyalty and trueſt intereſt. The principles of government laid down in it, are not only falſe, but too abſurd to have ever entered the head of a crazy politician before. Even Hobbes would bluſh to own the author for a diſciple. He unites the violence and rage of a republican, with all the enthuſiam and folly of a fanatic. If principles of truth and common ſenſe, however, would not ſerve his ſcheme, he could not help that by any other method than by inventing ſuch as* would; *and this he has done.*

No perſon breathing, has a deeper ſenſe of the preſent diſtreſſes of America, than I have—or would rejoice more to ſee them removed, and our liberties ſettled on a permanent, conſtitutional foundation. But this author's propoſal, inſtead of removing our grievances, would aggravate them a thouſand fold. The remedy is infinitely worſe than the diſeaſe. It would be like cutting off a leg, becauſe the toe happened to ache.

It is probable that this pamphlet, like others, will ſoon ſink in oblivion—that the deſtructive plan it holds out, will ſpeedily be forgotten, and vaniſh, like the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion; yet, while any honeſt man is in danger of being ſeduced by it—whilſt there is even a poſſibility that the dreadful evils it is calculated to produce, ſhould overtake us, I think it a duty which I owe to God, to my King and Country, to counteract, in this manner, the poiſon it contains. Nor do I think it leſs a duty thus to vindicate our honourable

honourable Congreſs, and my injured countrymen in general, from the duplicity and criminal inſincerity with which this pamphlet virtually charges them.

The reader, however, muſt not expect that I ſhould ſubmit to the drudgery of returning a diſtinct anſwer to every part of a pamphlet, in which the lines in many places are out-numbered by falſhoods; and where the author's malice and antipathy to monarchical government, miſrepreſent almoſt every thing relative to the ſubject. I have done, notwithſtanding, what I conceive to be ſufficient—I have developed his leading principles, and obviated ſuch miſrepreſentations as are apteſt to miſlead the unwary. I have, moreover, ſhewn that this ſcheme is big with ruin to America—that it is contrary to the ſentiments of the coloniſts, and that in a Reconciliation with Great-Britain, on ſolid, conſtitutional principles, excluding all parliamentary taxation, the happineſs and proſperity of this continent, are only to be ſought or found.

I neither have, nor can poſſibly have any intereſts ſeparate from thoſe of America—any object in view but her welfare. My fate is involved in her's. If ſhe becomes a conquered country, or an independent republic, I can promiſe myſelf no advantage or emolument in either caſe; but muſt inevitably ſhare with millions in the evils that will enſue. This I can declare, before the ſearcher of hearts, is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Can the author of Common Senſe *do the ſame? Can he truly and ſincerely ſay, that he has no honour, power, or profit in view, ſhould his darling republican ſcheme take place? If not, then he is an intereſted, prejudiced perſon, and very unfit to adviſe in this matter. We ſhould be diſtruſtful of his judgment, and on our guard againſt what he recommends.*

The author calls himſelf an Engliſhman, *but whether he is a native of* Old England, *or* New England *is a thing I neither know nor care about. I am only to know him by the features he hath here exhibited of himſelf, which are thoſe of an avowed, violent Republican, utterly averſe and unfriendly to the Engliſh conſtitution. He hath not pre-*

fixed

fixed his name to his pamphlet; neither ſhall I prefix mine to this. But as I fear his abilities juſt as little as I love his republican cauſe, I hereby pledge myſelf that in caſe he ſhould reply and publiſh his name; I alſo ſhould I think it neceſſary to rejoin ſhall publiſh my name. I honour genius wherever I meet with it; but deteſt its proſtitution to bad purpoſes. The few faint glimmerings of it that are thinly ſcattered through this pamphlet, are but a poor compenſation for its malevolent, pernicious deſign; and ſerve only to raiſe our indignation and abhorrence.

I hope the reader will diſtinguiſh—where there is a real difference—between this Republican's cauſe and that of America. If not, and if he is not willing to liſten calmly to truth, I adviſe him to ſtop here and lay down this pamphlet. But if the caſe be otherwiſe, I have only to beſeech him, whilſt peruſing theſe STRICTURES, *to remember, that they were written to promote our Reconciliation with a King and nation whom, not long ſince, we ſincerely loved and eſteemed. The bittereſt enmity I know, is that which ſubſiſts between thoſe who were once friends but have fallen out. On ſuch occaſions, and while our reſentment is high, the advice which tends to gratify that reſentment, may be the moſt welcome. But when our paſſions ſubſide, our former affections will alſo return; and we ſhall then look upon him to be much more our friend who would calm our reſentment, than him who would inflame it. From our former connection with Great Britain, we have already derived numberleſs advantages and benefits; from a cloſer union with her, on proper principles, we may derive ſtill greater benefits in future. Duty, gratitude, intereſt, nay Providence, by its all-wiſe diſpenſations, loudly call on both countries to unite, and would join them together; and may infamy be the portion of that wretch who would put them aſunder.*

February 16, 1776.

SECTION I.

STRICTURES *on the Author's Aſſertions concerning* "the "Origin and Deſign of Government in general; and his "Remarks on the Engliſh Conſtitution."

WRITERS on politics, like thoſe on philoſophy, are very apt to be warped by prejudice, and the ſyſtems they have previouſly adopted. They often draw general concluſions from particular premiſes, and form their judgements of human nature, not from a general view of mankind in their various ſituations; but from the conduct of a few individuals, and the particular ſtate of things at the time they wrote. Whilſt ſome of them pretend to delineate the true ſtate of human nature, perhaps they only give us a diſguſting picture of their own dark and gloomy minds, Moreover, thoſe writers are charged with founding their principles, not on nature and fact, but on their own prejudices, on improbable ſuppoſitions, and imaginary caſes, which never had an exiſtence. Hence that variety of viſionary political fabricks that have been raiſed, contradictory to each other, and repugnant to common ſenſe, and which will not bear the teſt of ſober examination. Some of them indeed may do very well on paper; but can never be reduced to practice, unleſs a race of beings, very different from men, can be found for the purpoſe.

Whilſt writers of this ſort amuſe themſelves with *Utopian* ſyſtems, and go no further, they may be borne with, and paſs without much cenſure. Their works may be read like other romances or fictions. But, if they preſume to looſe the bands of ſociety, and overturn governments that have been formed by the wiſdom of ages, to make way for their own crude ſyſtems, and thereby entail miſery and ruin upon millions; it is then abſolutely neceſſary to examine thoſe ſyſtems, point out their deſtructive tendency, and unmaſk the deceivers that propoſe them.

The author of a pamphlet, falſely and abſurdly entitled COMMON SENSE, is not only chargeable with a large portion of the above defects, in common with other political ſyſtem-makers, but alſo with the further deſign of rending the Britiſh empire aſunder. To realize his beloved ſcheme of Independent Republicaniſm, he would perſuade the coloniſts to renounce their allegiance to our true and lawful leige Sovereign King GEORGE III.—plunge themſelves into a tedious, bloody, and moſt expenſive war with Great-Britain—and riſk their lives, liberties, and property, on the dubious event of that war.

This is the principle object his pamphlet has in view; other things are only mentioned as conducive to that end. To prepare the reader for it—to take off that horror which every honeſt man, and well informed friend of America muſt naturally feel at a propoſal ſo wicked and ruinous; he firſt treats of ſome other matters which he faſhions to his purpoſe. He poiſons the fountain that the ſtream may be rejected. With this deſign, he delivers his ſentiments on Government, the Engliſh Conſtitution, and Monarchy. I ſhall now, very briefly, examine what he has offered on theſe ſubjects.

He tells us, that "ſome writers have confounded ſociety "with government;" and then ſupplies us with a diſtinction which is to ſet all right. He ſays, "Society is produced by "our wants, and government by our wickedneſs." We may reaſonably preſume there are neither wants nor wickedneſs in Heaven. According to this doctrine then, there can be no ſociety nor government there; and yet we are aſſured of the contrary.

This

This diſtinction is not only inaccurate, but it is alſo founded on falſe principles; and we might expect the reverſe of both, when the errors of others are profeſſedly corrected. Our wants do not produce ſociety; nor are they the firſt or principal cauſe of it. Did this gentleman ever know of any one that was born out of ſociety? Are we not, by an act of Providence, in our birth made members of ſociety? A ſtate of ſociety is the natural ſtate of man; and by the conſtitution of his mind and frame he is fitted for it. Not only his wants and weakneſs require it, but his inclinations, his nobleſt faculties impel him to it; and the more perfect thoſe faculties are, the better is he fitted for ſociety. As nature has thus made us members of ſociety, without any choice or will of ours; ſo, whatever happineſs or perfection we are capable of, can only be attained in ſociety.

This writer's account of the origin of government is equally exceptionable with that of the origin of ſociety. I can no more aſſent to it than to Hobbes's notion,---"that "mankind are naturally in a ſtate of war, and that go-"vernment in founded in ſuperior power or force."

Since Providence hath formed us for ſociety, and placed us in it from the time of our firſt exiſtence, I am of Hooker's opinion,---"that ſociety could not be without govern-"ment, nor government without law," though mankind were ever ſo virtuous. For what is government, but the regulation of ſociety by laws? It is well known to all who are converſant in hiſtory, that the different ſtates, the different forms of government which have ſubſiſted in the world, and of which we have any records, had their origin from a variety of cauſes peculiar to each. Of theſe I ſpeak not, but of government in general, wherein following my republican guide.

As we cannot doubt but the benevolent author of our being, wills our happineſs in the ſtate where he hath placed us, he ſurely wills alſo the means which lead to that end---thoſe means are order and government. Thus far I hold with the beſt republican writers on this ſubject, the divine right of government, whoſe end is the good of mankind; yet, without appropriating that right to any particular form,

excluſively of others. Were men as virtuous as angels; yet, if collected in large ſocieties, there muſt be a variety of ſtates and conditions among them; and wherever ſuch ſocieties are, government will be indiſpenſibly neceſſary.

But, not to enter deeply into this ſubject, which would be foreign to my deſign, I ſhall juſt obſerve, that man is a moral agent, and thereby fitted to be governed by laws:—He is born in ſociety, whoſe ends cannot be obtained, but by ſubordination, order and the regulation of laws; and where theſe are, there is government. I conclude, therefore, that government is agreeable to the will of the Deity---that it has its origin in the nature and ſtate of man---that in framing governments by mutual compact, men act according to the law of their nature, and dictates of reaſon, which thus point out the only effectual way to obtain happineſs and avoid evil. I draw my principles from nature and fact, without having recourſe to ſyſtem---the never failing refuge of weak minds, and of party writers.

Agreeable to the origin he aſſigns to government, our author ſeems to think the only buſineſs of government is to *puniſh*; for, he ſays, that as ſociety is a "patron," ſo government is "a puniſher." but to think thus, betrays an equal ignorance of the principles of government, and of matter of fact. Numberleſs bleſſings flow from government, beſides the ſecurity reſulting from a reſtraint of vice by puniſhing the vicious. Were there no wickedneſs, there would probably be little occaſion for penal laws; but are theſe the only laws enacted by government? The criminal law of any ſtate makes but a ſmall part of its general code. It is Livy, I think, who ſomewhere defines government to be, "The "empire of laws, and not of men." According to this definition, the laws of our author's government, *produced by wickedneſs*, would exerciſe a moſt tyrannical ſway---being deſigned only to *puniſh*, they would probably reſemble the laws of Draco, which were ſaid to be written in blood. Perſons who entertain ſuch notions of government, may be well calculated to form a ſanguinary code of laws, and afterwards to execute them; for, as we may ſuppoſe their principles are congenial with their minds and diſpoſition, doubtleſs they

they would feel very well inclined to inflict every kind of puniſhment without ſcruple.

To evince the truth of his aſſertion, that " Government " is produced by wickedneſs," our author adds, " Govern- " ment, like dreſs, is the badge of loſt innocence; the pa- " laces of Kings are built on the ruins of the bowers of " Paradiſe." This is mighty *florid*---what pity that it has no ſolidity! Juſt ſo, ſay I---ploughing and ſowing, like dreſs, are the badges of loſt innocence: The farmer's cottage, barn, ſtable, and hog-houſe are built upon the ruins of the bowers of Paradiſe; I cannot ſee that this *pretty* ſentence proves any thing but the author's enmity to Kings and monarchical governments: For, if he would hereby ſhew the inexpediency of either, the ſame argument will equally ſhew the inexpediency of ploughing and ſowing, of the farmer's cottage, barn, &c.

Having thus laid his foundation, the author proceeds to erect his ſuperſtructure; and I aſſure you, gentle reader, the one is perfectly ſuitable to the other. " In order to gain " a clear and juſt idea of the deſign and end of government," ſays he, " let us ſuppoſe a ſmall number of perſons ſettled in " ſome ſequeſtered part of the earth, unconnecte dwith the " reſt; they will repreſent the firſt peopling of any country, " or of the world. In this ſtate of natural liberty,"---well! what would they firſt do or think of? Why,---" ſociety will " be their firſt thought." This indeed might poſſibly happen, were we to ſuppoſe that theſe perſons had dropped from the clouds, or ſprung out of the earth, and could all ſpeak the ſame language. On any other principle, the caſe here ſtated is utterly devoid of probability.

The author in this, follows the example of ſome other manufacturers of political ſyſtems, who fly to fiction, when matters of fact ſhould be related: But, as he has managed things, his fiction is contradictory and replete with abſurdity: For he ſuppoſes that thoſe perſons " ſettled in ſome ſequeſ- " tered part of the earth," had emigrated---" that the firſt " difficulties of emigration had bound them together;" and yet gravely tells us, " their firſt thought," when ſettled, " would be ſociety!" I opine this thought would ſtrike them, and had been practiſed long before. But

But further: Amidſt "a thouſand motives that would "excite them thereto," i. e. ſociety, "one" among others, he ſays, would be that---"diſeaſe, nay even misfortune would "be death; for altho' neither might be mortal, yet either "would diſable any individual from living, and reduce him "to a ſtate in which he might rather be ſaid to periſh than "to die." Here, "diſeaſe, nay even misfortune" would be "death;" yet neither be "mortal;" yet ſtill either would "diſable from living;" but this would only be "periſhing" and not "dying!" here I give the author's own words---I did not make theſe contradictions and blunders, but found them.

It would be a waſte of time to trace this gentleman's wonderful colony any further; which is ſo far from "repreſent-"ing the firſt peopling of any country," that I ſincerely believe it repreſents the firſt peopling of no one country ſince the days of Adam; at leaſt my memory does not furniſh me with one parallel inſtance at preſent; and ſome parts of his ſcheme are deſtitute even of the fainteſt probability. It is very likely, however, that he had the firſt ſettlement of theſe Britiſh colonies in view, while thus helping us "to gain a "clear and juſt idea of the deſign and end of government." Many circumſtances favour this ſuppoſition; but there is not the leaſt reſemblance between them. The firſt Britiſh emigrants to America, were in a ſtate of ſociety before their emigration;---in England they jointly applied for grants of land here---they received grants, charters, and inſtructions, which veſted them with a legal title to thoſe lands, and marked the outlines of thoſe governments that were to be formed here. When thoſe emigrants found themſelves in America, they did not then firſt think of ſociety; for they were in a ſtate of ſociety before, and the governments they erected here, were conformable to the plans they had previouſly received in England.

After finiſhing this goodly political edifice, the author is pleaſed to beſtow ſome "remarks on the ſo much boaſted "conſtitution of England." He aſſures us---"he draws "his idea of the form of government from a principle "in nature which no art can overturn, viz. that the more

" more ſimple any thing is, the leſs liable it is to be diſ-
" ordered, and the eaſier repaired when diſordered; and
" with this maxim in view, he offers his remarks." But he inſtantly forgets his promiſe, and pays no regard to this maxim. Abſolute monarchy is, paſt all doubt, the ſimpleſt form of government; yet this gentleman prefers democracy, which is infinitely more complex, and the moſt liable to diſorders of any. The truth is, that this principle was uſhered in, purely to contraſt it with the complex nature of the Engliſh conſtitution, and thereby prejudice the reader againſt the latter. Let me add, that if, as he himſelf declares, " we are never in a proper condition of doing juſtice to
" others, while we continue under the influence of ſome
" leading partiality;" this partial, avowed republican, is one of the unfitteſt perſons breathing, to offer remarks on the Engliſh conſtitution. He cannot hold the ſcales of juſtice with an even hand.

" That the conſtitution of England was noble," ſays he, " for the dark and ſlaviſh times in which it was erected, is
" granted." This is condeſcending—it would be more ſo, had he informed us what " dark and ſlaviſh times" he refers to. The conſtitution of England, as it now ſtands, was fixed at the Revolution, in 1688—an æra ever memorable in the fair annals of Liberty. It was then that the limits of royal prerogative on the one hand, and the liberties and privileges of the ſubject, on the other; were aſcertained with preciſion. But certainly that was neither a " dark nor ſlaviſh time." It would not be worth while to contend with a man that could aſſert it. The lamp of ſcience never ſhone brighter in any country than in Britain, nor did patriots of greater fame ever adorn the cauſe of freedom, than thoſe who ſtood forth to aſſert her liberties, at that diſtinguiſhed period. If our author means any time before that, it is impertinent to the purpoſe, nor am I concerned about it. What is it to us, what the conſtitution of England was two or three hundred or a thouſand years ago? That conſtitution, as fixed at the revolution, as it *now* ſtands, is what we are intereſted in.

" But that it is imperfect," he continues, " ſubject to con-
" vulſions, and incapable of producing what it ſeems to
" promiſe, is eaſily demonſtrated." If he will be pleaſed to inform me of any political conſtitution, of human contrivance, that was, or is perfect, and not ſubject to convulſions, I ſhall be obliged to him, and readily give it the preference to that of England. But until he, or ſome other perſon does ſo, I ſhall continue in my preſent firm belief, that the conſtitution of England approaches the neareſt to perfection ---that it is productive of the greateſt happineſs and benefit to the ſubject, of any conſtitution on earth. Nor ſhall I heſitate to prefer it, in theſe reſpects, to any conſtitution that antiquity can boaſt of.

" But the conſtitution of England is ſo exceedingly com-
" plex, that the nation may ſuffer for years together, without
" being able to diſcover in which part the fault lies." Theſe are matters that fall not within my line---I leave them to ſuch *profound*, *eagle-eyed* politicians as our author. One thing is certain, that if any man is aggrieved, either in his perſon or property, he muſt ſoon know it; and in either caſe he has a ſpeedy remedy by the conſtitution of England. The late legal deciſion in favour of Mr. Wilkes, (no favourite of the court or miniſtry)---reſpecting general warrants, evidently demonſtrates the ſecurity enjoyed by an Engliſh ſubject, the equity and ſuperior excellence of the Britiſh conſtitution. But what is the complexneſs of that conſtitution to us? The conſtitution of the colonies is very ſimple; each being adminiſtered by a governor, council and aſſembly. Let our liberties, property and trade be once ſecured on a firm conſtitutional bottom, and the complexneſs of the Engliſh conſtitution cannot in the leaſt affect us.

Having hitherto ſkirmiſhed only at a diſtance, our author prepares now for a nearer and more formidable attack on the Engliſh conſtitution; ſuch as ſeems to threaten it with total demolition. " By examining its component parts, he finds
" them to be the baſe remains of two ancient tyrannies,
" compounded with ſome new republican materials. 1ſt.
" The remains of monarchial tyranny in the perſon of the
" King. 2d. The remains of ariſtocratical tyranny in the perſons

" perſons of the peers. 3. The new Republican materials, " in the perſons of the Commons; the two former being " hereditary, are independent of the people, and therefore " in a conſtitutional ſenſe contribute nothing towards the " freedom of the ſtate."

Here are ſeveral hard words; and as ſome readers may not well underſtand them, I ſhall beg leave to explain them. The learned reader will the more readily excuſe me, as this method may beſt elucidate the ſubject before us, and develope this vile medley of jargon and miſrepreſentation.

It is, I think, generally admitted by political writers, that there is in every ſtate, whatever its form of government may be, a ſupreme, abſolute power. The diſtribution of this power is what conſtitutes the different forms of government; and that form is beſt, which moſt effectually ſecures the greateſt ſhare of happineſs to the whole. There are uſually reckoned three forms of government, called *ſimple*, in oppoſition to thoſe which are compounded of all three, or only two of the three. The firſt is Monarchy, when the ſupreme power of a ſtate is lodged in one perſon. When this power is placed in the hands of a few, or ſmall number of nobles, it is called an Ariſtocracy, which is the ſecond form of ſimple government. The third is, where the ſovereign power is lodged in the people at large, and this is called Democracy.

Each of theſe forms is ſubject to abuſe, and often has been abuſed. The abuſe of Monarchy is called Tyranny—The abuſe of Ariſtocracy is called Oligarchy—The abuſe of Democracy is called Anarchy; though the word Tyranny may be applied to the abuſe of any of them. Our republican author applies it to the two former, even when not abuſed; and through his whole pamphlet he makes no diſtinction between the right uſe and abuſe of a thing. If he happens to diſlike it, as in the caſe of Monarchy, however reſtrained and calculated for the benefit of the ſubject, it is reprobated by the groſs—it is nothing but *Tyranny*.

It may not be improper to obſerve here, that monarchical governments are beſt adapted to extenſive dominions; popular governments to a ſmall territory. It is alſo worthy of

obſervation, that, although there have been, and ſtill are many abſolute monarchies, yet, no government was ever purely ariſtocratical or democtatical—owing, probably, to the unavoidable evils incident to each—or to the impracticableneſs of forming either. This is candidly owned by Harrington, a noted republican writer, "Though for diſ-"courſe, (ſays he) politicians ſpeak of pure ariſtocracy, and "pure democracy, there is no ſuch thing as either of theſe "in nature or example." Algernos Sidney, another republican writer, acknowledges the ſame.*

As each of theſe ſimple forms would be attended with numberleſs inconveniences, it has been the opinion of the wiſeſt men in every age, that a proper combination of the three, conſtitutes the beſt government. It is the peculiar, diſtinguiſhing glory of the Engliſh conſtitution, that it is a happy mixture of theſe; ſo tempered and balanced, that each is kept within its proper bounds, and the good of the whole thereby promoted.

For what is the Conſtitution?—that word ſo often uſed—ſo little underſtood—ſo much perverted. It is, as I conceive-----*that aſſemblage of laws, cuſtoms, and inſtitutions, which form the general ſyſtem; according to which, the ſeveral powers of the ſtate are diſtributed, and their reſpective rights are ſecured to the different members of the community.* By impartially examining the component parts of the Engliſh conſtitution, it will be found, that the ſupreme power is diſtributed in the beſt manner to attain this important end—the ſecurity of their reſpective rights to all the members of the community. Theſe parts are,—

1ſt. The King; who has the executive power, and other prerogatives, which are all ſo ordered, ſo reſtrained within conſtitutional limits, as to prevent their being injurious. He can take no man's money, or property of any kind, without a law paſſed by the other branches of the legiſlature for that purpoſe. He can take no man's life, before the perſon has had a trial, and is condemned by his peers. He can deprive no man of his liberty, unleſs the perſon has violated the laws of the ſtate. And this is what our *candid* republican

* *See his works, page* 132.

republican calls the "baſe remains of monarchical tyranny."

2d. The Peers; who are one branch of the legiſlature, and in ſome caſes, have a ſhare in the judicial power. They have other privileges alſo, but all circumſcribed ſo as to prevent injury to others. As theſe are chiefly hereditary, and are veſted with large property, they are equally independent of the crown and people, and deeply intereſted in the welfare of the ſtate. Hence they form a ſtrong barrier againſt any encroachment from either of the other branches, and give ſtability to the conſtitution. Theſe are what our *gentle* republican calls "the baſe remains of ariſtocratical tyranny."

3d. The Houſe of Commons; the members of which are choſen by the people; without whoſe conſent, no money can be levied, nor law paſſed to bind the ſubject; and who are themſelves, as well as others, bound by the laws that are enacted. Theſe are what our author calls the "new republican materials." But why *new?* The Houſe of Commons was not firſt formed at the Revolution. Its origin is hid in the remote depths of antiquity. It may be traced with certainty for near ſix hundred years back;—ſome, eſpecially republican writers, trace it much further; although it may have undergone ſeveral variations before the revolution. Calling it *new*, therefore, is juſt of a piece with many other of our author's expreſſions.

The ſupreme power of the ſtate is diſtributed among theſe three branches of the Britiſh legiſlature in ſuch a manner, that the conſtitution has almoſt all the advantages of each of the three ſimple forms of government, and ſcarcely any of their inconveniences. On preſerving an equal poize in each of theſe branches, depends the good of the whole: No prudent man, therefore, no real friend of Britiſh Liberty, will ever wiſh to ſee any of them paſs the conſtitutional limits; or attempt to throw power into any of them which would deſtroy the balance.

This is a plain, conciſe repreſentation of the Engliſh conſtitution. It is ſufficient to refute our Republican's miſrepreſentation of it, juſt as relating truth, in other caſes, is a ſufficient refutation of falſhood. But leſt he, or my reader, ſhould think that I mean to ſkip over any thing that has the

appearance of argument, I ſhall follow him a little further on this ſubject.

" To ſay, that the conſtitution of England is an union of " three powers reciprocally checking each other is farcical," he tells us. This is a new and ſhort method of confutation, ſuch indeed as nothing can withſtand. How happy is it for mankind, that this acute reaſoner has not thought proper to employ it, in ſhewing the nullity of the reciprocal duties and obligations ſubſiſting between huſband and wife, parent and child, maſter and ſervant! They muſt all have infallibly vaniſhed, and have been annihilated by a few *farcical* ſtrokes of his pen! Yet ſo it happens, that the beſt and wiſeſt men, the warmeſt advocates of liberty, have viewed this reciprocal check of the three branches of the legiſlature, not as " farcical, unmeaning or contradictory;" but as the moſt effectual method that human wiſdom could deviſe to promote happineſs and liberty.

Still, however, he inſiſts---that " to ſay the Commons are a check upon the King, preſuppoſes two things. 1. That " the King is not to be truſted without being looked after." I think no man ſhould be truſted with uncountrouled power during life.---No, not even a *ſelf-denying*, *humble* Republican. " Or, that a thirſt of abſolute power is the natural " diſeaſe of monarchy."---Not a jot more ſo than of republicaniſm. 2. That " the Commons by being appointed for " that purpoſe, are either wiſer or more worthy of confi- " dence than the King. But as the ſame conſtitution which " gives the Commons a power to check the King, gives af- " terwards the King a power to check the Commons; it a- " gain ſuppoſes that the King is wiſer than thoſe, whom " it has already ſuppoſed to be wiſer than him. A mere " abſurdity!"

There is, I confeſs, a palpable abſurdity here; but it lies in our author's *ſuppoſitions*, concerning what the conſtitution *ſuppoſes*; not in the mutual check which the King and Commons have upon each other. Is it not highly abſurd to ſuppoſe, that a man, becauſe he has a conſtitutional check upon others, muſt therefore be wiſer than thoſe others? A common conſtable has, in many caſes, a check upon his fellow

fellow ſubjects; does it therefore follow that he muſt be wiſer, or that the conſtitution *ſuppoſes* he is wiſer than they?

The remaining part of this ſection is ſuch miſerable ſtuff, that it would only be flinging away time to *expoſe* it;---it is not worthy of *confutation*. It conſiſts of declamation againſt the Engliſh conſtitution that would diſgrace a ſchool-boy. Some expreſſions, indeed, ſuch as theſe, "That the En-"gliſh conſtitution is too incomprehenſible to be within the "compaſs of deſcription,---that no power can be from God "that needs checking," with others of the ſame kind, ſeem to flow from inſanity, and to be rather the effuſions of a diſtempered brain, than the language of a perſon poſſeſſed of *common*, or any other, *ſenſe*.

I ſhall conclude this head by referring my reader to the teſtimony of one of the beſt judges in ſubjects of this ſort, and the greateſt maſters of juriſprudence, that any age has produced, in favour of the Engliſh conſtitution,---I mean the celebrated MONTESQUIEU. His teſtimony will out-weigh, with the judicious, the ſilly declamations of ten thouſand ſuch *Politicaſters* as our republican author. The paſſage I allude to is in book xi. Chap. 6. *Of the Spirit of Laws*,---though many others of the ſame kind are interſperſed in that excellent work.

SECTION II.

STRICTURES on the Author's Sentiments, "*Of Monarchy* "*and hereditary* Succeſſion."

COME we now to our author's obſervations on "Monarchy and hereditary Succeſſion." The laſt of theſe I ſhall ſay little about, for the following reaſons. I have humility enough to think, that thoſe illuſtrious patriots who ſettled the ſucceſſion of the crown of England in the Houſe of Hanover, ſoon after the revolution, knew full as much of the matter as I do,---or as even our author knows. What they

they did in this reſpect, I believe was right, and therefore acquieſce in it. Few, I imagine, will diſſent from my opinion on this head, notwithſtanding this author's objections. In the next place, the crudities here offered concerning hereditary ſucceſſion, are not new, but borrowed from other writers.---Moſt of them may be found in a ſmall treatiſe* written by one John Hall, a penſioner under Oliver Cromwell; and I have nothing to do with John Hall, but with the author of Common Senſe. Hereditary monarchy is infinitely preferable to elective, and more conducive to the welfare of mankind. In Poland we ſee a ſpecimen of the miſery and wretchedneſs to which elective monarchy expoſes a nation.

But it will be proper to beſtow a few minutes in examining what is here alledged concerning monarchy in general; againſt which this republican marſhals a formidable hoſt of arguments. The reader will remember, that monarchy may be either abſolute; or mixed and combined with the other ſimple forms of government. Our author makes no diſtinction between theſe; and although he ſays, and a thouſand times more that might be ſaid, were true with reſpect to the former; yet all this would not militate in the leaſt againſt the mild and tempered monarchy of Great-Britain. Let us however attend to his arguments.

" In the early ages of the world, according to ſcripture " chronology, there were no kings; the conſequence of " which was, there were no wars; it is the pride of kings " which throws mankind into confuſion. Holland without " a King hath enjoyed more peace for this laſt century, than " any of the monarchical governments in Europe." It were needleſs, at preſent, to determine how early kings began to reign; eſpecially as we find by ſcripture chronology and ſcripture hiſtory, that there was murder, violence and war ---that " the earth was filled with violence"---long enough before we hear a ſyllable about Kings---I may ſay before there were any. Referring thoſe diſorders, therefore, to that

* *The Grounds and Reaſons of Monarchy conſidered and exemplified in the Scotch Line, &c.* By JOHN HALL, *of* Gray's-Inn, *Eſquire; bound with* Harrington's *works*,

that origin, is unfair and untrue. Melchizedec is one of the firſt kings we read of; he lived in the times of patriarchal ſimplicity, and his character is reſpectable, being not only a king, but alſo "the prieſt of the moſt High God." This account of kings is very different from our author's.

The inſtance of Holland is injudiciouſly ſelected, to ſhew that ſtates which have no kings, are therefore exempt from war. There has not been a general war in Europe for a century paſt, in which Holland was not deeply engaged; except the very laſt, and this was more owing to inability than any other cauſe. Every page almoſt of the hiſtory of the *Seven United Provinces*, is a refutation of our author's aſſertion. His inſinuation, that ſtates which have not kings, are exempt from, and not addicted to war, is equally groundleſs. Republics have been as much involved in wars as other ſtates. The ſeveral republics of Greece inliſted under the banners of Sparta, on one ſide, or thoſe of Athens on the other---both republics waged a moſt bloody war for thirty years together. And what is very remarkable, they were plunged into this war by Pericles, a popular Athenian, and celebrated ſpeaker; who being impeached for *embezling the public money* and applying it to his *own private uſe*, took this terrible method to divert an enquiry. The war ended in the deſtruction of Athens. The ſingle republic of Rome, made greater havoc of the human ſpecies, ſhed more blood, diffuſed more wretchedneſs and miſery through the earth, and was guilty of more cruelty, oppreſſion and tyranny, than perhaps any *three* monarchies that can be mentioned in the whole compaſs of ancient hiſtory. If a few ſmall republics of modern date, have more reſpite from war than ſome monarchies, it is more owing, like their very exiſtence, to their particular ſituations, the jealouſy of neighbouring powers, and other ſimilar circumſtances, than to the nature of their government.

"Government by Kings," this writer tells us, "was "firſt introduced by Heathens." And ſo, ſay I, was Greek and Latin---ſo was ſmoaking tobacco; and yet I can dip into Homer and Virgil, or enjoy my pipe, with great compoſure of conſcience. The firſt hint of bleeding, in caſes

caſes of ſickneſs, is ſaid to have been taken from the crocodile---of adminiſtring clyſters, from the Ibis, an Egyptian bird. Theſe ſeem to be of worſe than heathen origin; yet mankind uſe them without ſcruple; and perhaps their diſcipline might not be amiſs for our author, conſidering his ſtate of mind. If a thing is good in itſelf, I conceive it to be a matter of very little moment, who it was that firſt introduced it. I am clearly of opinion alſo, that democracy, our author's favourite ſcheme of government, was of heatheniſh origin, as well as monarchy: And ſince he is ſo averſe to any thing heatheniſh, I would beg leave to remind him, that falſhood, deceit, and ſpeaking evil of dignities, are heatheniſh crimes, and expreſsly forbidden by ſcripture.

But the worſt is yet to come; for "government by Kings, "was the moſt proſperous invention the devil ever ſet on "foot for the promotion of idolatry. The heathens paid "divine honours to their deceaſed Kings." If the devil was the author of this invention, for the purpoſe here alledged, then I aver he was miſtaken in his forecaſt; or elſe he ſoon retained all the Heathen republics in his ſervice, to promote the ſame end. For it is a moſt notorious, undeniable fact, that the ancient republics---Rome, Carthage, Athens, &c. were as infamous for every ſpecies of the groſſeſt and moſt abominable idolatry, as any monarchies whatever. Let the Floralia of Rome, and human ſacrifices offered at Carthage, to mention no other inſtances, ſerve as proofs of this. The truth is, that idolatry had ſpread its gloomy reign almoſt univerſally over the Heathen world. The form of government in any ſtate, neither promoted nor retarded it any more than the ſhape of their ſhields, or the form of their whiſkers. The pureſt ſyſtem of religion, that Heathen antiquity can boaſt of, prevailed in Perſia, where monarchy was eſtabliſhed; the remains of which religion, are ſaid to be preferred to this day among the inhabitants of Indoſtan.

But "Heathens paid divine honors to their deceaſed "Kings." The more fools they, no doubt; however, they did the ſame to their deceaſed heroes, and benefactors in general, whether Kings or not, whether male or female. If

this,

this argument, therefore, is of any force againſt government by Kings, it is of equal force againſt any improvement in agriculture; againſt cleaning ſtables and killing ſnakes; for Heathens paid divine honours to deceaſed perſons for all thoſe exploits. It is ſcarcely poſſible to return a grave anſwer to ſuch ſophiſtry; eſpecially, when the author may, perhaps, care as little for the Bible, as he does for the Alcoran or Shaſthah, only as it may ſerve his purpoſe.

From Heathenism our author flies next to ſcripture for arguments againſt monarchy. Were I a parſon I ſhould be better qualified to deal with them in this way. However, as I am a ſincere believer in divine revelation, I ſometimes read the Scripture for inſtruction---nor am I aſhamed to own it---Boyle, Locke, and Newton did the ſame. I alſo have recourſe ſometimes to a few commentators, which the clergyman of the place where I live, hath recommended to me. Thus furniſhed, I ſhall venture to examine his ſcripture arguments. One conſolation to me is, that he ſeems to be an equal adept in theology and juriſprudence.

" The will of the Almighty, as declared by Gideon and " Samuel (ſays our republican) expreſly diſapproves of go- " vernment by Kings." So it might on theſe particular occaſions, and for ſome particular reaſons; and yet our government by Kings at this time, may be as acceptable to the Almighty, as any other government. " All anti-monar- " chical parts of ſcripture (he continues) have been ſmooth- " ly gloſſed over in monarchical governments." If ſo, our author has profited by the practice, and has greatly improved on it; for he has entirely ſlipt over (without giving even a *ſmooth gloſs*) all the monarchical parts of Scripture, except one, which, I ſhall immediately conſider; after aſſuring the reader, that I never have met with the anti-monarchical parts of Scripture. In the bible, I am ſure they are not. The Jewiſh polity, in which the Almighty himſelf condeſcended to be King (and thence called a Theocracy) is rather in favour of monarchy than againſt it; though I am not clear, that any one ſpecies of regular government is more acceptable to the Deity now than another; whatever prefer-

ence

ence may be due to one above another, in point of expediency and benefit.

" Render unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's, is the " Scripture doctrine of courts," ſays our author; and pray, is it not Scripture doctrine in other places, as well as courts? Is it not the doctrine of Him who is the Saviour of men? The words are part of an anſwer which our Saviour returned to an inſidious queſtion that was propoſed to him by ſome emiſſaries from the Phariſees, viz. Whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæſar, i. e. the Roman Emperor, or not; Judæa was at this time ſubject to the Romans. The Gaulonites, or Zealots, a ſect or party ſo called, affirmed that the Jews, being God's people, ſhould not acknowledge any other Lord, nor pay tribute to an heathen power---others affirmed the contrary---the determination was therefore put to Jeſus, with deſign to enſnare him. His deciſion, which was for paying the tribute, was grounded on the then practice and eſtabliſhed maxims of the Jews. They held, that whereever the money of any perſon, bearing his title and image, was current, the inhabitants thereby acknowledged that perſon for their ſovereign. Since, therefore, the Jews owned this of Cæſar, by admitting his money, which bore his title and image, our Saviour told them, they ſhould alſo pay him tribute. For he ordered the tribute money to be brought, and the Jews owning that it bore Cæſar's image and ſuperſcription, or title---" Render, therefore (ſays he) to Cæſar " the things that are Cæſar's," i. e. ſince you acknowledge his ſovereignty over you, by admitting his coin, render to him the tribute which, on your own principles, is thereby due.

If this text has been applied to ſupport monarchical government any further than to ſhew, that whatever is by cuſtom, law, or otherwiſe, juſtly due to ſovereigns, ſhould be punctually paid, whether it be tribute, obedience, honour, &c.---if, I ſay, it has been applied to ſupport monarchy any further than this, it muſt be by ſome perſon who underſtood it as little as our author; though not for the reaſon he aſſigns, and which in truth makes againſt himſelf.

But

But I haſten to the paſſages of Scripture, in which our republican author triumphs moſt; which, he ſays, "are di-"rect and poſitive, and admit of no equivocal conſtruction. "That the Almighty has in them entered his proteſt a-"gainſt monarchical government, is true, or elſe the Scrip-"ture is falſe." On the contrary, I aver, that the Almighty has not there entered his proteſt againſt monarchical government, further than the Jews had departed from a former permiſſion he had given them to chuſe Kings, and that the Scripture is not falſe. Let us now ſee how a little common ſenſe, reaſon and truth, will help to clear up the matter.

The paſſages alluded to by the author, are in 1 Sam. viii. where the Iſraelites aſſembled in a tumultuous manner, and deſired Samuel to make them "a King to judge them like "all the nations;" which offended Samuel, and in ſome meaſure was diſpleaſing to the Almighty. That ſimply deſiring a King, could not be a crime, is undeniably evident; becauſe the Almighty had long before expreſly permitted it, had directed the mode of chuſing a King, and preſcribed the line of conduct the King ſhould obſerve, when choſen. This is done in Deuteronomy xvii. 14—20; and I ſhall here lay a few of the paſſages before the reader.

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord "thy God giveth thee, and ſhalt ſay, I will ſet a King over "me, like as all the nations that are round about me; "thou ſhalt in any wiſe ſet him King over thee whom "the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe: one from among thy "brethren ſhalt thou ſet King over thee: thou mayeſt not "ſet a ſtranger over thee which is not thy brother."

The Almighty then proceeds to give directions for the King's conduct thus choſen; all, wiſely ſuited to the Jewiſh ſtate, both in a religious and political view. The King "was not to multiply horſes;" to prevent any intercourſe with Egypt, which ſupplied other nations with horſes; and beſides, cavalry was not ſuited to the hilly country of Judæa. The King was "not to multiply wives, that his "heart turn not away;" as happened to Solomon when he diſobeyed this precept: Nor "greatly multiply gold and ſil-

ver to himſelf," which would introduce luxury and diſſolution of manners.

The directions go on—" And it ſhall be when he, i. e. " the King, ſitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that " he ſhall write a copy of this law in a book, and it ſhall " be with him, and he ſhall read therein all the days of his " life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep " all the words of this law, and theſe ſtatutes to do them: " that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and " that he turn not aſide from the commandment—to the " end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom; he " and his children in the midſt of Iſrael."

Now, after this, I leave the reader to judge, whether government by Kings could be diſpleaſing to the Almighty; or, whether deſiring a King, according to this permiſſion, and theſe directions, could be a crime in the Iſraelites. It is impoſſible that either can be true. The crime of theſe people, therefore, when they deſired a King of Samuel, " to judge them like all the nations," muſt be attributed to ſomething elſe. And upon examination, we ſhall find, that their error lay in the *manner* of their aſking a King---in the *principles* on which they acted---in a *diſregard* of the venerable old prophet---but chiefly, in a *neglect* of the *directions* above mentioned. This will appear evident from a bare recital of facts.

Samuel, by his faithful adminiſtration, had reſtored the purity of religion, and reſcued the nation from the hoſtile attempts of their enemies. Debauched by Proſperity, as too frequently happens, dazzled with the luſtre of a ſplendid court, and deſirous of its pomp, the people tumultuouſly aſſembled to deſire a King, who would reſemble the deſpotic Kings which ſurrounded them. They covered their real deſign with the pretext of Samuel's age and infirmities, and his ſon's irregularities, which was inſulting the prophet's misfortunes. This is evidently implied in their own words, and in the ſequel.

" Behold, (ſay they to Samuel) thou art old, and thy " ſons walk not in thy ways; now make us a King to judge " us like all the nations." Hereby Samuel, who had faithfully

fully ſerved them, had been diſplaced; and ſuch a deſpotic Prince as they deſired, had deſtroyed the theocracy they were under. Accordingly, the Almighty tells Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, "that I ſhould not reign over them." i. e. It is not thee, ſo much as me, that they have rejected. Although Samuel was ungratefully treated; yet they ſtill more wickedly neneglected the directions given by the Almighty. Pride and ambition, ſtimulated them to ſeek a King, not ſuch as the Almighty had directed them to chuſe; but ſuch as the nations had; and as would overturn the theocracy, This was virtually rejecting the Almighty from being their King.

Samuel, however, was directed to hearken to the people; but at the ſame time to lay alſo before them, the nature of that monarchy they deſired; a monarchy like thoſe around them. The eaſtern nations, it is well known, were under deſpotic monarchs, the *manner* or nature of which, Samuel accordingly deſcribes to the Iſraelites, to try, whether they would perſiſt in their choice after hearing it. Kings of this ſort would "take their ſons and appoint them for himſelf, "for his chariots, and to be his horſemen---he would take "their daughters to be confectioners, and to be cooks, and "to be bakers, &c. &c."

This whole paſſage is a deſcription of the eaſtern deſpotic monarchs, which Samuel held up to the Iſraelites, with deſign to deter them from chuſing ſuch; and this is the paſſage which our author ſets down, enriched with his own moſt *judicious* comments, to ſhew that God "entered his proteſt "againſt monarchical government in general." Whereas, in truth, it is only an account of the then deſpotic monarchies of the Eaſt, which Samuel was directed to lay before the Iſraelites, that they might ſee how inconſiſtent ſuch a monarchy was with their peculiar ſtate and circumſtances; and this again with deſign to divert them from chuſing ſuch.

Ambition and pride, however, got the better of duty and intereſt with the people---a caſe that happens but too frequently. They ſtill inſiſted on having the King they had ſet their hearts on---"That we alſo, ſay they, may be like other "nations." Hereby ſhewing the greateſt blindneſs to their

own

own happineſs, which conſiſted in being unlike the other nations, by having God himſelf for their King; and ſuch a Judge or King as would be his DEPUTY, not an abſolute Prince. The Almighty at laſt condeſcended to their infirmities, and gave them a King: but as in the caſe of the ritual law, he tempered his juſtice with mercy, he gave them Saul, who proved a ſcourge; yet he ordered matters ſo that the general end of his diſpenſation to the Jews was not defeated. Saul's ſucceſſor was "a man after his own heart," by a zealous attachment to, and punctual execution of, the Moſaic law in his regal character; and David again, in our author's phraſe, "to the evil of monarchy, added that of "hereditary ſucceſſion;" which it ſeems, however, the Almighty did not diſapprove of.

The reader is now left to determine freely, whether theſe paſſages make in the leaſt againſt government by Kings; and whether this republican's perverſion of them, either through real or effected ignorance, ſhould have any weight to influence us againſt our ſovereign. For my part, I think the caſe ſo plain, that I ſhall not beſtow another word upon it; only to add the following reflections of a learned writer on the above tranſactions. "The ſecret ſpring of the people's "conduct (ſays he) was the ambition of their leaders, who "could live no longer without the ſplendor of a regal court "—where every one of them might ſhine a diſtinguiſhed "officer of ſtate. This it was that made their demand cri-"minal; for their chuſing regal, rather than ariſtocratical, "vice-roys, was a thing plainly indulged to them by the "law of Moſes, Deuteronomy xvii. As therefore ambiti-"on only was in the view of the ringleaders, and no fool-"iſh fears for the ſtate, or hopes of bettering the public "adminiſtration, it is evident to all acquainted with the ge-"nius of this time and people, that compliance with their "demand muſt have ended in the utter deſtruction of the "Moſaic religion, as well as law." With this writer the moſt celebrated commentators on this paſſage agree.

Thus, ambition ſet the Iſraelites on deſiring a King; our republican author ſhould reflect, whether the ſame principle does not actuate and lead him to reject his lawful ſovereign.

The

The author of *Common Senſe* ſuſpects, " there is as much " King-craft as Prieſt-craft in witholding the Scripture from " the public in Popiſh countries, for monarchy is the Po- " pery of government." But is it not ſtrange, that he himſelf ſhould be guilty of the very crime he here charges upon others? Yet he does this, by witholding from the reader every text that would develope the falſhood of his own beloved ſcheme. This, I think, may be called *Republican*-craft; and let it, hereafter, be added to the two ſpecies of *craft* above-mentioned. A man of candor would deal fairly, and give both ſides of the queſtion. Had there been another text in the bible that could be preſſed into his ſervice, beſides what he has quoted, we may be ſure he would have produced it, with his own *enlightened* comments. With his good leave, therefore, I ſhall now ſet down a few texts, which probably, he may call the " Scripture doctrine of monarchy;" but which are the words of inſpired truth notwithſtanding. I aſſure the reader further, that I am none of your *paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance men.* The principles on which the glorious Revolution in 1688 was brought about, conſtitute the articles of my political creed; and were it neceſſary, I could clearly evince, that theſe are perfectly conformable to the doctrines of ſcripture. To proceed then, like a parſon, with my texts; referring in the margin, to the places in which they are contained, that the reader may conſult them at his leiſure.

" Deſtroy him not," ſays David to Abiſhai, when about to kill Saul, who was entirely in their power. " Deſtroy " him not; for who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the " Lord's anointed, and be guiltleſs *(a)*? " Curſe not the " King, no, not in thy thought *(b)*," was the admonition of a wiſe, inſpired preacher. Eternal wiſdom is introduced, declaring, " By me Kings reign and Princes decree juſ- " tice *(c)*." The wiſe man's advice is, " My ſon, fear " thou the Lord and the King; and meddle not with " them that are given to change *(d)*." Kings are promiſed for

(a) 1 Sam. xxvi. 9. *(b)* Eccleſ. x. 20.
(c) Prov. viii. 15. *(d)* Prov. xxiv. 21.

for "nurſing fathers" to the chriſtian church(e). The prophet Daniel declares of the Almighty—"He changeth "the times and the ſeaſons: He removeth Kings, and ſet-"teth up Kings(f)." The ſame prophet ſays, "The "moſt High ruleth in the Kingdom of men, and giveth it "to whomſoever he will(g)." Theſe are a few of the many texts to be found in the Old Teſtament, which contradict our author's ſcheme. If we look into the New Teſtament, which properly contains the religion of Chriſtians, we find the ſame doctrine more explicitly inculcated.

"Let every ſoul be ſubject unto the higher powers," was Paul's direction to the Romans. "For there is no power "but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God(h)." I ſeem inclined to think that Paul did not believe with our author, that "Government by Kings, was the invention of "the Devil!" "I exhort," ſays the ſame apoſtle, in another place, "that firſt of all, ſupplications and prayers be "made for all men; for Kings, and for all that are in au-"thority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in "all godlineſs and honeſty(i)."

Let us hear another apoſtle, namely, Peter.---"Submit "yourſelves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's ſake; "whether it be to the King, as ſupreme; or unto Gover-"nors, as unto them that are ſent by him for the puniſh-"ment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do "well. As free, and not uſing your liberty for a cloak "of maliciouſneſs, but as the ſervants of God. Love the "brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the King(k)." In another part of his writings, I meet with this remarkable paſſage "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly---and to re-"ſerve the unjuſt unto the day of judgment, to be puniſh-"ed; But chiefly them which walk after the fleſh, and de-"ſpiſe Government: Preſumptuous are they, ſelf-willed, "they are not afraid to ſpeak evil of dignities(l)." To the ſame purpoſe, another apoſtle, Jude, ſays---"Likewiſe,

(e) Iſaiah xlix. 23.
(f) Dan. i. 21.
(g) Dan. iv. 25.
(h) Rom. xiii.
(i) 1 Tim. ii: 1, 2.
(k) 1 Peter ii. 13, 17.
(l) 2 Peter ii. 9, 10.

" wiſe, theſe filthy dreamers, deſpiſe dominion, and ſpeak " evil of dignities. Yet Michael, the Arch-angel, when " contending with the Devil, he diſputed about the body of Moſes, durſt not bring againſt him a railing accuſation." But ſaid, "The Lord rebuke thee(*m*)." One would think that theſe apoſtles had ſpoken directly of our COMMON SENSE author, and meant to deſcribe him and ſuch as him.

All theſe texts, beſides many others of the ſame kind, I find in my bible. I muſt therefore renounce my bible, if I believe this republican. But I would not renounce the bible, which contains the words of eternal life, for any earthly conſideration—no, not if this Gentleman were to aſſure me of being made Perpetual Dictator, Stadtholder, or Protector of his new Republic. I have taken the trouble to tranſcribe the above texts, however unuſual the employment, merely to lay the plain truth, the genuine teſtimony of Scripture on this point, before ſuch as might not be at the pains of examining it themſelves; and might therefore be miſled by our author. I confeſs, I felt both aſtoniſhment and indignation at his abuſe of ſacred writ. Had his principles, reſpecting monarchy, been good, had truth been their baſis, certainly, this had not been neceſſary. But he is not the firſt *tempter* that would ſeduce others by the perverſion of Scripture.

SECTION III.

STRICTURES on what the Author delivers as his "*Thoughts on the preſent State of American Affairs.*"

IF the perſon who was capable of ſo vile a proſtitution of of Scripture, as we have ſeen in the preceeding Section, ſhould equally proſtitute the words Reaſon, Argument, and Common Senſe in this, it is not to be wondered at. That this is the caſe, will appear by a near examination. From the author's deſultory way of writing, and want of method in de-

 livering

(*m*) Jude, *verſes* 8, 8.

livering his thoughts, it is not eaſy to follow him,—however, I muſt do as well as I can.

In this ſection before me, this Gentleman unfolds his grand ſcheme of a Revolt from the Crown of England, and ſetting up an Independent Republic in America. He leaves no method untried, which the moſt experienced practitioner in the art of deceiving could invent, to perſuade any people to a meaſure, which was againſt their inclinations and intereſt, that was both diſagreeable and deſtructive. He unſays in one place what he had ſaid in another, if it happens to ſerve the preſent purpoſe;—he cants and whines,—he tries wit, raillery and declamation by turns: But his main attack, is upon the paſſions of his readers, eſpecially their pity and reſentment,—the latter of which is too apt to be predominant in mankind. As for himſelf, he ſeems to be every where tranſported with rage—a rage that knows no limits, and hurries him along like an impetuous torrent. Every thing that falls in with his own ſcheme, or that he happens to diſlike, is repreſented in the moſt aggravated light, and with the moſt diſtorted features. Such a malignant ſpirit I have ſeldom met with in any compoſition. As often as I look into this ſection, I cannot forbear imagining to myſelf a guilty culprit, freſh reeking from the laſhes of indignant juſtice, and raging againſt the hand that inflicted them. Yet I cannot perſuade myſelf, that ſuch fire and fury are genuine marks of patriotiſm. On the contrary, they rather indicate, that ſome mortifying diſappointment is rankling at heart; or that ſome tempting object of ambition is in view; or probably both. I always adopt the famous Biſhop Berkeley's maxim in ſuch caſes,—" I ſee a man rage, rail and rave; I ſuſ-" ſpect his patriotiſm."

That theſe obſervations are juſtified by the author's own words, I ſhall now proceed to evince; and I doubt not but the candid reader will conſider what I ſay in the ſenſe it is meant—as directed againſt this republican's ruinous ſcheme of Independency. *This*, and this *only*, is what I combat. My moſt ardent wiſhes—next to future happineſs—is, to ſee tranquillity reſtored to America—our Liberties, Property, and Trade, ſettled on a firm, generous and conſtitutional plan,

ſo

ſo that neither of the former ſhould be invaded, nor the latter impoliticly or unjuſtly reſtrained; that in conſequence of this, a perfect Reconciliation with Great-Britain were effected, an Union formed, by which both countries ſupporting and ſupported by each other, might riſe to eminence and glory, and be the admiration of mankind till time ſhall be no more. In ſuch a plan, the real intereſt of America is indubitably to be ſought; and could my influence avail, there would not be a diſſenting voice in the colonies---all would unite as one man, and uſe every effort, to have ſuch a plan ſpeedily ſettled.

The author of Common Senſe ſays, "He has no other "preliminaries to ſettle with the reader, than that he would "diveſt himſelf of prejudice and prepoſſeſſion, and ſuffer "his reaſons and feelings to determine for themſelves." I have no objection to theſe preliminaries. They are ſuch as I myſelf would chuſe to ſettle with the reader; provided his feelings are not thoſe of rage and reſentment, which are exceedingly improper to determine in matters of ſuch moment. It is not improbable indeed, that every republican who is as prejudiced, intereſted, and vindictive as himſelf, will agree with him in all his extravagancies; and ſo perhaps they would, though an Angel from Heaven were to aſſure them that they are wrong. But I am confident the readers of that ſtamp make but a very ſmall number at preſent in America.

After obſerving, that "many writers have embarked in "the preſent controverſy, with various deſigns," he ſays, "they have all been ineffectual, and the period of debate "is cloſed. Arms, as the laſt reſource, decide the con-"teſt; the appeal was the choice of the King, and the con-"tinent accepted the challenge." That an appeal was made by the King to arms for the deciſion of this unhappy conteſt, on the 19th of April, the period our author fixes, is a matter in which I am not quite clear; but more of this preſently. If ſuch a challenge was accepted by the Americans, I am ſure it was with great reluctance. They deſired it not; although this writer, by his manner of expreſſion, inſinuates they did. But be theſe matters as they will, cer-

tain it is, that the period of debate did not then close. The challenge was not accepted so as to exclude an amicable accommodation. Since that time, the Honourable Continental Congress petitioned the King, and transmitted addresses to the inhabitants of Great-Britain and Ireland, to facilitate a Reconciliation. Nor can I conceive it possible, that any one, unless some sanguinary wretch, who hopes to profit by our confusions, should wish to see the contest finally decided by arms.

" By referring the matter from argument to arms, a " new æra of politics is struck—all plans, proposals, &c. " prior to the 19th of April—are like the almanacks of " last year; which, tho' proper then, are superceded and " useless now." I shall not undertake to decide on the value of old almanacks, as I am not an Almanack-maker—the author may know more of the matter. But he here takes for granted what should have been proven, viz. that the matter or contest was ultimately referred from argument to arms. If the sense of our Congress, and of the inhabitants of this continent at large, is any rule to judge by, all plans and proposals, even those prior to the 19th of April are not useless. A free people, who have a just sense of their rights and liberties, are very justifiable in shewing they will not tamely give them up without a struggle. But no people, except some tribes of savages, who aim at the total extermination of their enemies, will ever lose sight of argument and negociation, to terminate such disputes. To insinuate the contrary of the Americans, is at once doing them the greatest injustice, and offering them the greatest insult. No people under Heaven are less sanguinary, or deserve such a character less.

Our author repeats the same sentiment elsewhere. " No man," says he, " was a warmer wisher for reconciliation " than myself, before the fatal 19th of April, 1775; but " the moment the event of that day was made known, I " rejected the hardened, sullen tempered Pharoah of En- " gland for ever; and disdain the wretch, that with the pre- " tended title of father to his people, can unfeelingly hear " of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood

" upon

" upon his ſoul." This is the man, gentle reader, who declares, " he is not induced by motives of pride, party or " reſentment, to eſpouſe the doctrine of ſeparation and " independence;" no, no; and, if you will take his own word for it, he is by no means for " inflaming or exagge- " rating matters!" The reader muſt be ſenſible, that a perſon who can thus ſet truth and decency at defiance, and is regardleſs of even the appearance of conſiſtency, has a great advantage over his antagoniſt.

That the expedition to Lexington was raſh and ill-judged —that it was riſking the peace of the continent, and wantonly involving fellow ſubjects in blood, for a moſt inconſiderable object—I ſhall moſt readily allow; and our author has my leave to load that expedition with all the reproaches he can invent. I diſapprove the deſign of it as much as he —I lament its effects much more. And from whatever unhappy circumſtances it aroſe, I am well aſſured, from the very beſt authority, that the King's orders to all his Commanders or Generals on this continent, were to act *only on the defenſive*, and in ſupport of the laws. Now, after giving ſuch reſtraining orders, how the blood of thoſe who were killed on either ſide, at the diſtance of 3000 miles from him, could be "" on his ſoul" is utterly inconceivable. If this Republican, therefore, rejected his ſovereign, on account of the unforeſeen bloodſhed at Lexington, it was only becauſe he had little attachment to him before; and this opportunity was only ſeized by the author to give vent to a diſaffection which only ſlumbered before. Thus, by wilful ſlanders, to poiſon the minds of fellow ſubjects, and ſow diſaffection among them, which may be productive of general miſery, is a crime of ſuch complicated guilt, that none but men of the moſt abandoned profligate hearts, are capable of committing.

After all, it is impoſſible to aſſign any good reaſon, why a Reconciliation with Great-Britain, which was ſo proper before the Lexington affair, ſhould be ſo improper afterwards. Our author, indeed, in his uſual way, dogmatically aſſerts it; but his aſſertions will not paſs for proofs. If peace and reconciliation on conſtitutional grounds, and proper ſecurity for

for our ſeveral rights, were deſirable and advantageous before the 19th of April, 1775, muſt they not have been equally ſo after the event of that unfortunate day? Let reaſon and common ſenſe anſwer.

"But as ſo much has been ſaid of the advantages of reconciliation," continues our author, "it is but right we "ſhould examine the contrary ſide of the argument, and "enquire into the material injuries which the colonies ſuſtain, and always will ſuſtain, by being connected with "Great-Britain." He alledges, indeed, ſeveral evils, which he ſuppoſes would attend that connection; but cautiouſly avoids any mention of the numberleſs evils and calamities which we muſt infallibly ſuffer by breaking it off. As in a former caſe, ſo in this alſo, I ſhall endeavour to ſupply this omiſſion in due time.

"Some have aſſerted," he tells us, "that as America "hath flouriſhed under her former connection with Great-"Britain, that the ſame connection is neceſſary towards her "future happineſs. Nothing can be more fallacious." He adds—"We may as well aſſert, that becauſe a child hath "thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat." However glib this quaint ſimile may run upon paper; or however convincing it may appear to ſhallow readers; yet, in truth, when examined, it contains a palpable impropriety, and is impertinent to the caſe before us. Great-Britain is figuratively called the Parent State of the colonies; their connection, therefore, may be properly compared to the *relation* ſubſiſting between parent and child. But to compare our *connection* with Great-Britain to the *literal food* of a child, a thing different from, and not neceſſarily belonging to that *relation*, is manifeſtly abſurd, and a violation of the propriety of language; as all who are judges of the nature of language muſt be ſenſible. The *relation* of parent and child ends not, when the latter has arrived to maturity, although the uſe of *milk* may be laid aſide; and that relation may be ſtill neceſſary to the happineſs of both; the ſame may be truly affirmed of *connection* with Great-Britain. But if we muſt ſtretch the ſimile further, we find ſomething analogous to the literal food of a child, it is the litteral ſupport afford-

ed.

ed by Great-Britain to the colonies, in their infant ſtate *formerly*; and the adminiſtration of the colonies *now*, as well as the general laws of regulation ſhe may make for us. As to any ſupport now, in the above ſenſe, it is confeſſed the colonies in general do not require it. With reſpect to the adminiſtration of the colonies, and regulating laws proper for them, theſe ſhould certainly be varied, and adapted to our maturer ſtate. The want of this is the true ſource of our preſent calamities; and the attainment of it, by a reconciliation and conſtitutional union with Great-Britain, is what every honeſt American ſhould earneſtly wiſh for. But the remedy propoſed by our author, would reſemble the conduct of a raſh, froward ſtripling, who ſhould call his mother a d-mn-d b--ch, ſwear he had no relation to her, and attempt to knock her down.

" But even this," ſubjoins our author, " is admitting " more than is true; for I anſwer, roundly, that America " would have flouriſhed as much, and probably much more, " had no European taken any notice of her. The com- " merce by which ſhe hath enriched herſelf, are the neceſ- " ſaries of life, and will always have a market while eating " is the cuſtom of Europe." If no European power had taken any notice of America, that is to ſay, if none had been at the expence or trouble of diſcovering it, and ſettling colonies in it, there is great propability that America had not flouriſhed, but remained to this day as ſavage a wilderneſs, as when Columbus or Cabot firſt deſcried its coaſts.— But to paſs over this blunder. Let the reader only turn to any hiſtory of the ſettlement of the Britiſh colonies, and then judge what had been the condition of Virginia, the firſt colony, and latterly of Georgia and Nova-Scotia, if Great-Britain had not ſupported them. They muſt as infallibly have periſhed, as an infant without its proper food, had not Great-Britain afforded her aid and ſupport; which have been more or leſs extended to the colonies in general. Even after they had ſurmounted their firſt difficulties, what had been their fate, had not Great-Britain protected them? It ſo happens, that avarice, ambition and fighting, are cuſtoms of Europe as well as eating. This being the caſe, ſome other

European

European power would indubitably have ſeized all theſe colonies, in their infant ſtate, had not Great-Britain held out her protection.

And here, much matter of grief is preſented to this poor Gentleman. He pathetically laments, that---" Alas! we " have been long led away by ancient prejudices, and made " large ſacrifices to ſuperſtition---not conſidering that the " motive of Great-Britain in protecting us, was intereſt, not " attachment;" and then he ſpins out a tedious, affected ſentence of her " not protecting us from our enemies on " our account, but from her enemies on her own account," &c. Suppoſing this were true, where is the harm? Great-Britain actually *did* protect us; and it is a matter of little moment to us, what her motives were. If ſhe received benefit by it, ſo much the better. Mutual intereſt is the ſtrongeſt bond of union between ſtates, as the hiſtory of mankind teſtifies; and certainly that nation would act a moſt abſurd, as well as wicked part, which laviſhed away its blood and treaſure, without any proſpect of national advantage in return. But I firmly believe, that his aſſertions on this head are as falſe, as they are ungenerous; and that Great-Britain, in protecting us, was actuated by motives of affection and attachment, as well as intereſt. The whole of her conduct to the colonies, till lately, evinces it---the Americans themſelves have acknowledged it. Great-Britain, no doubt, derived many advantages from the colonies; but ſhould we undervalue her protection on that account, or aſcribe it to ſordid motives only? It is every man's intereſt as well as duty to be honeſt; would it, therefore, be candid, generous or true, to ſuppoſe, that every honeſt man is actuated by ſelfiſhneſs only?---But candour and truth are things that have nothing to do with the procedure of this dark republican, who aims at utterly effacing every trace of former affection and friendſhip between Great-Britain and the colonies; and like a fiend that delighted in human miſery, would arm them with the moſt deadly, irreconciliable hatred againſt each other.

But he denies that Britain is the parent country of theſe colonies. He " reprobates the phraſe, as being falſe, ſelfiſh, " narrow and ungenerous.---Europe, (ſays he) and not " England,

" England, is the parent country of the colonies." It is an obſervation of Epictetus, " That if a man will contra-
" dict the moſt evident truths, it will not be eaſy to find ar-
" guments wherewith to confute him---that the diſpoſition
" to contradict ſuch truths, proceeds from want of candor
" and modeſty." He moreover adds---that when *ſome adventurous* ſpirits in his time, undertook to deny the plaineſt and moſt evident truths---" This denial was admired by the
" vulgar for ſtrength of wit and great learning."

Whatever circumſtances can denominate any country to be the parent ſtate or country of colonies, may be truly predicated of England, with reſpect to theſe American colonies. They were diſcovered at the Expence of the Engliſh crown---firſt ſettled by Engliſh emigrants, and the governments erected here were formed on the model of the Engliſh government, as nearly as the ſtate of things would admit. The coloniſts were deemed Engliſh ſubjects, and entitled to all the privileges of Engliſhmen. They were ſupported and protected at the expence of Engliſh blood and treaſure. Emigrants, it is true, reſorted here from other countries in great numbers; but theſe were not intitled to all the privileges of Engliſh ſubjects, till naturalized by an act of the Engliſh legiſlature, or ſome Aſſembly here; and the prodigious confluence of ſtrangers into the colonies, is a proof of the mild and liberal ſpirit by which they were cheriſhed and adminiſtered. If theſe particulars does not entitle England to the appellation of mother-country to theſe colonies, I know not what can; and theſe particulars cannot be predicated of any other country in Europe beſides England.

The author tells us, however---" that the phraſe parent
" or mother country, hath been jeſuitically adopted by the
" King and his paraſites, with a low papiſtical deſign of
" gaining an unfair bias on the credulous weakneſs of our
" minds." I conceive the preſent King, or his paraſites, as he calls them, were not the firſt or only perſons who adopted this phraſe; and, therefore, it could not anſwer ſuch a deſign. The phraſe hath already been uſed, both here, and in Britain, ſince the firſt ſettlement of the colonies.

But this curious obſervation was introduced purely to in-

ſinuate the King is a papiſt; which has juſt as much truth in it, as to inſinuate that he is a Mahometan or Gentoo; for there is not a firmer proteſtant in Great-Britain, than his preſent Majeſty. The inſinuations might have ſome effect on the credulous weakneſs of ſome ignorant people, who have harboured ſuch an opinion; and I have heard the Quebec-bill alledged as a proof of it, by which, they ſaid, "popery was eſtabliſhed in Canada, and the King had violated his coronation oath."

An examination of the Quebec-bill, falls not within the compaſs of my deſign. It has undergone the ſcrutiny of much abler hands; ſome of which have affirmed, and others denied, that popery was thereby eſtabliſhed. I diſlike the bill, chiefly becauſe it veſts the Governor and his Council with exorbitant power. It is certain, however, that the popiſh clergy of Canada, complain of the bill, and think themſelves in a worſe ſituation by it, than the articles of capitulation and ſurrender left them. By its exempting ſuch Canadians as come over to the proteſtant religion, from paying any eccleſiaſtical dues to their prieſts, it would ſeem, as if the bill was intended to diminiſh the number of papiſts. Be all this as it may, it is paſt any doubt, that the King did not in the leaſt violate his coronation oath by aſſenting to that bill. This will evidently appear by inſpecting the oath itſelf: and as the removal of mutual prejudices to faciliate a reconciliation, is my principal view; as the oath is ſhort, and has been ſeen by few, I ſhall here inſert it. The coronation oath is adminiſtered by one of the archbiſhops or biſhops, in the following words and manner---

The archbiſhop ſhall ſay, Will you ſolemnly promiſe and ſwear, to govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the ſtatutes in parliament agreed on, and the laws and cuſtoms of the ſame? *The King ſhall ſay*, I ſolemnly promiſe ſo to do.

The archbiſhop. Will you, to your power, cauſe law and juſtice, in mercy, to be executed in all your judgments?

King. I will.

The archbiſhop. Will you to the utmoſt of your power, maintain the laws of God; the true profeſſion of the goſpel, and

and the proteſtant reformed religion, eſtabliſhed by law? And will you preſerve unto the biſhops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all ſuch rights and privileges, as by the law do or ſhall appertain unto them, or any of them?

King. All this I promiſe to do.

After this, the King, laying his hand on the holy goſpel, ſhall ſay, The things which I have here before promiſed, I will perform and keep: So help me God. *And then ſhall kiſs the book.*

This is the coronation oath, and mode of adminiſtering it, as preſcribed by law; and the reader may ſee that it has no more relation to the ſtate of religion in Canada, a conquered province, than to the ſtate of religion in Minorca, a conquered iſland, the inhabitants of which are papiſts, and enjoy as great, if not greater privileges than the Canadians.

"But admitting," continues our author, "that we were "all of Engliſh deſcent, what does it amount to? Nothing. "Britain being now an open enemy, extinguiſhes every "other name and title; and to ſay that reconciliation is a "duty, is truly farcical." Here the *farcical* argument meets me again; and what ſhall I ſay to it? I proteſt I do not underſtand it. I have ſearched for its meaning in vain; and have no hope of fathoming it, till the author is pleaſed to explain it*. But to the point in hand. If what would promote

F 2

* *The author, elſewhere, recommends a manœuvre, to which I apprehend, the word* farcical *may be properly applied. After kindly offering a republican form of government, which he deſires may be adopted in America, he introduces a perſon aſking this queſtion—"But where is the King of America?" and then returns this anſwer—"I'll tell you friend, he reigns above; and doth not make "havock of mankind like the* Royal Brute *of Great-Britain." This* pretty flower, *with which he garniſhes our Sovereign, ſeems to be culled rather from the* bowers of Billingſgate, *than thoſe of* Paradiſe, *formerly mentioned. The reader cannot forbear ſeeing here the enthuſiaſm of* Fifth-monarchy *men, and their rudeneſs too. Strange that this Republican's rage ſhould blind him ſo that he cannot ſee what every body elſe ſees—that—*

——"*Want of decency is want of ſenſe!*"

But

promote our happineſs and intereſt, to mention nothing elſe, be a duty, then Reconciliation is our duty.

He elſewhere enlarges on this head. "Bring the doc-" trine of reconciliation," ſays he, "to the touch-ſtone of "nature, and then tell me, whether you can hereafter "love, honour, and faithfully ſerve the power that carried "fire and ſword into your land!" All this, and a great deal more of the kind, can only proceed from a ſuppoſition of the author, that others are as vindictive and unforgiving as himſelf. When ſtates go to war, mutual acts of hoſtility muſt neceſſarily enſue; and to think that no reconciliation ſhould afterwards take place between them, is as contrary to every dictate of humanity and religion, as to think, that a private perſon ſhould never forgive a private injury, or be reconciled to him that offered it. I lament as much as any one, the blood that has been ſhed, and the devaſtation that has been made during this conteſt: But theſe have been comparatively ſmall, if we conſider the torrents of blood that have flowed, the wide-ſpread ruin that has attended the frequent deſtructive wars between England and Scotland; yet theſe nations are now happily united---they mutually love, honour, and faithfully ſerve each other.

The author refers us to the ſtate of Boſton, and paints the diſtreſſes of its inhabitants in the ſtrongeſt colours, to ſtimulate the revenge of Americans, and baniſh every idea of reconciliation with Britain. I ſincerely take part in the calamities of Boſton, and other places that have ſuffered. I feel

But to return. The farcical *paſſage next follows*—"*Yet that "we may not appear defective in earthly honours, let a day be ſo-"lemnly ſet apart for proclaiming the* [*Continental*] *Charter; let "it be brought forth placed on the Divine law, the word of God, let "a crown be placed thereon*—*But leaſt any ill uſe ſhould afterwards "ariſe, let the crown, at the concluſion of the ceremony, be demo-"liſhed and ſcattered among the people whoſe gift it is.*" *I now ſubmit it to the reader's better judgment, whether this whole ceremony is not highly* farcical; *eſpecially as this Republican has given us the ſtrongeſt ſuſpicion that he has an* equal *regard for the word of God, and for Kings and monarchical government. If I am wrong in this conjecture, I utterly deſpair of ſucceſs in finding out the meaning of this word.*

feel the moſt tender ſympathetic pity for the diſtreſſes of their inhabitants. But how the ſhedding of more blood, or ſpreading equal devaſtation along the whole ſea-coaſt of this continent---the inevitable conſequences of not liſtening to reconciliation---how theſe, I ſay, can alleviate the misfortunes of the people of Boſton, or any other ſufferers, is what I am not able to ſee.

" Much hath been ſaid," he tells us, " of the united " ſtrength of Britain and the Colonies; that in conjunction " they might bid defiance to the world: But this is a mere " preſumption; the fate of war is uncertain---the next war " may not turn out like the laſt." But he chaunts quite another tune, when he would hold up the advantages of a ſeparation from Britain. In that caſe he avers---" 'Tis not " in the power of England, or of Europe to conquer Ame- " rica---nay, our preſent numbers are ſufficient to repel " the force of the whole world!"---This is only one ſample among a thouſand, of the duplicity and contradiction which run through his pamphlet.

After telling us, what is very true, that we have no buſineſs to " ſet the world at defiance," he adds, as an inducement to ſeparate from Britain---" Our plan is commerce; " and that well attended to, will ſecure us the peace and " friendſhip of Europe, becauſe it is the intereſt of Europe " to have America a free port. Her trade will always be a " protection, and her barrenneſs of gold and ſilver will ſe- " cure her from invaders."---Yes, yes; no doubt, if America were once to throw off her connection with Britain, the golden age would be reſtored! The Millennial ſtate would commence. " Men would inſtantly beat their ſwords into " plough-ſhears, and their ſpears into pruning hooks. Na- " tion would not lift up ſword againſt nation, nor learn war " any more." Such are the happy times our author promiſes us. if America were an independent republic! But until he can give us ſome aſſurance that may be relied on, that ambition, pride, avarice, and all that dark train of paſſions which uſually attend them, will be extinguiſhed in the human breaſt, and will no more exert their baneful influence, I muſt beg leave to doubt the truth of his aſſertions---I muſt

queſtion

queſtion, whether we ſhall live in perpetual peace with Europe, or even with each other, after our revolt from England.

The arguments or reaſon he advances for it here, is contradicted by a general experience and matter of fact. A flouriſhing trade naturally increaſes wealth; and for this and other reaſons, as naturally leads to war. Carthage, Venice and Holland---all commercial republics---were frequently engaged in bloody wars, in the days of their proſperity. Nor is "barrenneſs of gold and ſilver" any ſecurity againſt war or invaſions. Experience and fact are equally againſt this poſition. I never heard of the gold or ſilver mines of Flanders. The Low Countries are entirely barren of both; but they are remarkable for their fertility, good paſturage, manufactures, and formerly for trade: Yet I may ſay, each field there is a field of blood, and has been the ſcene of ſome dreadful carnage. Great-Britain and France have few or no gold and ſilver mines; yet they have been theatres of bloody wars, as long as any record we have of either reaches. On the other hand, South-America ſupplies half the globe with gold and ſilver; and yet, ſtrange to tell, on our author's principles, no rival power has ever contended with Spain or Portugal for the dominion of South-America! No invaders have attempted to diſpoſſeſs them.

The truth is, that mines producing thoſe metals are rather injurious than beneficial to any country. They unbrace the nerves of induſtry, induce ſloth, and damp the ſpirit of commerce. Spain was one of the moſt flouriſhing, powerful monarchies in Europe, when this continent was diſcovered. Peru and Mexico then poured their immenſe treaſures into her lap, and have been doing ſo ever ſince; yet Spain, ever ſince, has been on the decline, and is dwindled, notwithſtanding her gold and ſilver, into a ſtate, I may ſay, of inſignificance. The country that abounds in fertile fields and luxuriant paſturage---that produces the neceſſaries of life in abundance---that furniſhes the various materials for induſtry and art, and the articles for an extenſive commerce; ſuch a country, though barren of gold and ſilver, is the moſt inviting to ambition, the moſt expoſed to invaſions; and ſuch a country is North-America.

But

But our author now waxes ſo exceedingly warm, and aſſumes ſo terrific an air, that I almoſt dread to approach him. " I challenge," ſays he, " the warmeſt advocate for " reconciliation, to ſhew a ſingle advantage that this coun- " try can reap by being connected with Great-Britain, Ire- " peat the challenge, not a ſingle advantage is derived."

The poſitive, dogmatical manner in which this challenge is repeated, reminds me of an obſervation made by the excellent Dr. Beattie, which applies, in the preſent caſe, as exactly, as if this bluſtering challenge had given riſe to it. " In reading ſceptical books," ſays the worthy Doctor, " I have often found, that the ſtrength of the author's at- " tachment to his paradox, is in proportion to its abſurdi- " ty. If it deviates but a little from common opinion, he " gives himſelf but little trouble about it; if it be inconſiſ- " tent with univerſal belief, he condeſcends to argue the " matter, and to bring what, with him, paſſes for a proof of " it; If it be ſuch as no man ever did or could believe, he is " ſtill more conceited of his proof and calls it demonſtration; " but if it is inconceivable, it is a wonder if he does not take " it for granted." Our republican takes it for granted, that no advantage could reſult from our future connection with Great-Britain---a paradox which I think muſt be utterly inconceivable to every other human underſtanding. Brimful, however, of this conceit, he throws down his gauntlet, and offers this challenge; leaving his readers to ſtare a convenient time, and to heſitate which they ſhould admire moſt--- the abſurdity of taking this point for granted---or, the *fortitude of face* that could advance ſuch a paradox.

I think it no difficult matter to point out many advantages which will certainly attend our reconciliation and connection with Great-Britain, on a firm, conſtitutional plan. I ſhall ſelect a few of theſe; and that their importance may be more clearly diſcerned, I ſhall afterwards point out ſome of the evils which inevitably muſt attend our ſeparating from Britain, and declaring for independency. On each article I ſhall ſtudy brevity.

1. By a reconciliation with Britain, a period would be put to the preſent calamitous war, by which ſo many lives have

have been loſt, and ſo many more muſt be loſt, if it continues. This alone is an advantage devoutly to be wiſhed for. This author ſays---" The blood of the ſlain, the " weeping voice of nature cries, 'Tis time to part." I think they cry juſt the reverſe. The blood of the ſlain, the weeping voice of nature cries---It is time to be reconciled; it is time to lay aſide thoſe animoſities which have puſhed on Britons to ſhed the blood of Britons; it is high time that thoſe who are connected by the endearing ties of religion, kindred and country, ſhould reſume their former friendſhip, and be united in the bond of mutual affection, as their intereſts are inſeparably united.

2. By a Reconciliation with Great-Britain, Peace---that faireſt offspring and gift of Heaven---will be reſtored. In one reſpect Peace is like health; we do not ſufficiently know its value but by its abſence. What uneaſineſs and anxiety, what evils has this ſhort interruption of peace with the parent-ſtate brought on the whole Britiſh empire! Let every man only conſult his feelings---I except my antagoniſt---and it will require no great force of rhetoric to convince him, that a removal of thoſe evils, and a reſtoration of peace, would be a ſingular advantage and bleſſing.

3. Agriculture, commerce, and induſtry would reſume their wonted vigor. At preſent they languiſh and droop, both here and in Britain; and muſt continue to do ſo while this unhappy conteſt remains unſettled.

4. By a connection with Great-Britain, our trade would ſtill have the protection of the greateſt naval power in the world. England has the advantage, in this reſpect, of every other ſtate, whether of ancient or modern times. Her inſular ſituation, her nurſeries for ſeamen, the ſuperiority of thoſe ſeamen above others---theſe circumſtances to mention no other, combine to make her the firſt maritime power in the univerſe---ſuch exactly is the power whoſe protection we want for our commerce. To ſuppoſe, with our author, that we ſhould have no war, were we to revolt from England, is too abſurd to deſerve a confutation. I could juſt as ſoon ſet about refuting the reveries of ſome brain-ſick enthuſiaſt. Paſt experience ſhews that Britain is able to defend our commerce,

merce, and our coaſts; and we have no reaſon to doubt of her being able to do ſo for the future.

5. The protection of our trade, while connected with Britain, will not coſt us a *fiftieth* part of what it muſt coſt, were we ourſelves to raiſe a naval force ſufficient for the purpoſe.

6. Whilſt connected with Great-Britain, we have a bounty on almoſt every article of exportation; and we may be better ſupplied with goods by her, than we could elſewhere. What our author ſays is true---" that our imported goods " muſt be paid for, buy them where we will;" but we may buy them dearer, and of worſe quality, in one place than another. The manufactures of Great-Britain confeſſedly ſurpaſs any in the world---particularly thoſe in every kind of metal, which we want moſt; and no country can afford linens and woollens, of equal quality cheaper.

7. When a Reconciliation is effected, and things return into the old channel, a few years of peace will reſtore every thing to its priſtine ſtate. Emigrants will flow in as uſual from the different parts of Europe. Population will advance with the ſame rapid progreſs as formerly, and our lands will riſe in value.

Theſe advantages are not imaginary but real. They are ſuch as we have already experienced; and ſuch as we may derive from a connection with Great-Britain for ages to come. Each of theſe might eaſily be enlarged on, and others added to them; but I only mean to ſuggeſt a few hints to the reader.

Let us now, if you pleaſe, take a view of the other ſide of the queſtion. Suppoſe we were to revolt from Great-Britain, declare ourſelves Independent, and ſet up a Republic of our own---what would be the conſequence?---I ſtand aghaſt at the proſpect---my blood runs chill when I think of the calamities, the complicated evils that muſt enſue, and may be clearly foreſeen---it is impoſſible for any man to foreſee them all. Our author cautiouſly avoids ſaying any thing of the inconveniences that would attend a ſeparation. He does not even ſuppoſe that any inconvenience would attend it. Let us only declare ourſelves independent, break looſe from Great-Britain, and according to him, a Paradiſaical ſtate will follow! But a prudent man will conſider and

weigh matters well before he conſents to ſuch a meaſure---when on the brink of ſuch a dreadful precipice, he muſt neceſſarily recoil, and think of the conſequences, before he advances a ſtep forward. Suppoſing then we declared for Independency,---what would follow? I anſwer----

1. All our property throughout the continent would be unhinged; the greateſt confuſion, and moſt violent convulſions would take place. It would not be here, as it was in England at the Revolution in 1688. That revolution was not brought about by any defeazance or diſannulling the right of ſucceſſion. JAMES II, by abdicating the throne, left it vacant for the next in ſucceſſion; accordingly his eldeſt daughter and her huſband ſtept in. Every other matter went on in the uſual, regular way; and the conſtitution, inſtead of being diſſolved, was ſtrengthened. But in caſe of our revolt, the old conſtitution would be totally ſubverted. The common bond that tied us together, and by which our property was ſecured, would be ſnapt aſunder. It is not to be doubted but our Congreſs would endeavour to apply ſome remedy for thoſe evils; but with all deference to that reſpectable body, I do not apprehend that any remedy in their power would be adequate, at leaſt for ſome time. I do not chuſe to be more explicit; but I am able to ſupport my opinion.

2. What a horrid ſituation would thouſands be reduced to who have taken the oath of allegiance to the King; yet contrary to their oath, as well as inclination, muſt be compelled to renounce that allegiance, or abandon all their property in America! How many thouſands more would be reduced to a ſimilar ſituation; who, although they took not that oath, yet would think it inconſiſtent with their duty and a good conſcience to renounce their Sovereign; I dare ſay theſe will appear trifling difficulties to our author; but whatever he may think, there are thouſands and thouſands who would ſooner loſe all they had in the world, nay life itſelf, than thus wound their conſcience. A Declaration of Independency would infallibly diſunite and divide the coloniſts.

3. By a Declaration for Independency, every avenue to an accommodation with Great-Britain would be cloſed; the ſword only could then decide the quarrel; and the ſword would

would not be ſheathed till one had conquered the other.

The importance of theſe colonies to Britain need not be enlarged on, it is a thing ſo univerſally known. The greater their importance is to her, ſo much the more obſtinate will her ſtruggle be not to loſe them. The independency of America would, in the end deprive her of the Weſt-Indies, ſhake her empire to the foundation, and reduce her to a ſtate of the moſt mortifying inſignificance. Great-Britain therefore muſt, for her own preſervation, riſk every thing, and exert her whole ſtrength, to prevent ſuch an event from taking place. This being the caſe----

4. Devaſtation and ruin muſt mark the progreſs of this war along the ſea-coaſt of America. Hitherto, Britain has not exerted her power. Her numbers of troops and ſhips of war here, at preſent, is very little more than ſhe judged expedient in time of peace---the former does not amount to 12,000 men---nor the latter to 40 ſhips, including frigates. Both ſhe and the colonies, hoped for and expected an accommodation; neither of them has loſt ſight of that deſireable object. The ſeas have been open to our ſhips; and although ſome ſkirmiſhes have unfortunately happened, yet a ray of hope ſtill cheared both ſides that, peace was not diſtant. But as ſoon as we declare for Independency, every proſpect of this kind muſt vaniſh. Ruthleſs war, with all its aggravated horrors, will ravage our once happy land---our ſea-coaſts and ports will be ruined, and our ſhips taken. Torrents of blood will be ſpilt, and thouſands reduced to beggary and wretchedneſs.

This melancholy conteſt would laſt till one ſide conquered. Suppoſing Britain to be victorious; however high my opinion is of Britiſh Generoſity. I ſhould be exceedingly ſorry to receive terms from her in the haughty tone of a conqueror. Or ſuppoſing ſuch a failure of her manufactures, commerce and ſtrength, that victory ſhould incline to the ſide of America; yet, who can ſay in that caſe, what extremities her ſenſe of reſentment and ſelf-preſervation will drive Great-Britain to? For my part, I ſhould not in the leaſt be ſurpriſed, if on ſuch a proſpect as the Independency of America, ſhe would parcel out this continent to the different Eu-

ropean Powers. Canada might be reſtored to France, Florida to Spain, with additions to each---other ſtates alſo might come in for a portion. Let no man think this chimerical or improbable. The independency of America would be ſo fatal to Britain, that ſhe would leave nothing in her power undone to prevent it. I believe as firmly as I do my own exiſtence, that if every other method failed, ſhe would try ſome ſuch expedient as this, to diſconcert our ſcheme of independency; and let any man figure to himſelf the ſituation of theſe Britiſh colonies, if only Canada were reſtored to France!

5. But ſuppoſing once more that we were able to cut off every regiment that Britain can ſpare or hire, and to deſtroy every ſhip ſhe can ſend---that we could beat off any other European power that would preſume to intrude upon this continent: Yet, a republican form of government would neither ſuit the genius of the people, nor the extent of America.

In nothing is the wiſdom of a legiſlator more conſpicuous than in adapting his form of government to the genius, manners, diſpoſition and other circumſtances of the people with whom he is concerned. If this important point is overlooked, confuſion will enſue; his ſyſtem will ſink into neglect and ruin. Whatever checks or barriers may be interpoſed, nature will always ſurmount them, and finally prevail. It was chiefly by attention to this circumſtance, that Lycurgus and Solon were ſo much celebrated; and that their reſpective republics roſe afterwards to ſuch eminence, and acquired ſuch ſtability.

The Americans are properly Britons. They have the manners, habits, and ideas of Britons; and have been accuſtomed to a ſimilar form of government. But Britons never could bear the extremes, either of monarchy or republicaniſm. Some of their Kings have aimed at deſpotiſm; but always failed. Repeated efforts have been made towards democracy, and they equally failed. Once indeed republicaniſm triumphed over the conſtitution; the deſpotiſm of one perſon enſued; both were finally expelled. The inhabitants of Great-Britain were quite anxious for the reſtoration

ſtoration of *royalty* in 1660, as they were for its expulſion in 1642, and for ſome ſucceeding years. If we may judge of future events by paſt tranſactions, in ſimilar circumſtances, this would moſt probably be the caſe of America, were a republican form of government adopted in our preſent ferment. After much blood was ſhed, thoſe confuſions would terminate in the deſpotiſm of ſome one ſucceſsful adventurer; and ſhould the Americans be ſo fortunate as to emancipate themſelves from that thraldom, perhaps the whole would end in a limited monarchy, after ſhedding as much more blood. Limited monarchy is the form of government which is moſt favourable to liberty---which is beſt adapted to the genius and temper of Britons; although here and there among us a crack-brained zealot for democracy or abſolute monarchy, may be ſometimes found.

Beſides the unſuitableneſs of the republican form to the genius of the people, America is too extenſive for it. That form may do well enough for a ſingle city, or ſmall territory; but would be utterly improper for ſuch a continent as this. America is too unwieldy for the feeble, dilatory adminiſtration of democracy. Rome had the moſt extenſive dominions of any ancient republic. But it ſhould be remembered, that very ſoon after the ſpirit of conqueſt carried the Romans beyond the limits that were proportioned to their conſtitution, they fell under a deſpotic yoke. A very few years had elapſed from the time of their conquering Greece and firſt entering Aſia, till the battle of Pharſalia, where Julius Cæſar put an end to the liberties of his country. Cæſar himſelf was the firſt who entirely ſubdued the Gauls, though near neighbours, and that penetrated into Britain. Had it not been for the rivalſhip between Sylla and Marius, who were a check upon each other, Rome had ſurrendered her liberties before to one or other of thoſe tyrants. Holland is the moſt conſiderable republic in Europe, at preſent; yet the ſmall kingdom of Ireland is more than *twice* as large as the *Seven United Provinces*. Holland, indeed, has conſiderable colonies in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies; but theſe are under as rigid and arbitrary an adminiſtration as any colonies of France or Spain.

The

The author of *Common Senſe*, in his abundant care and providence, lays before the public a ſketch of the government he would recommend. We thank him for his kindneſs; but diſlike his ware. It is patch-work, and would make *ſad work* in America. The principal outlines of this ſketch ſeem to be taken from Mr. Harrington's *Rota*, which was too romantic even for the times of *Cromwell*. Our author has made ſuch alterations as he conceived would adapt it to America. It is as much in the democratic ſtyle as the *Rota*; and as improper for America, as the other was for England. I may truly ſay of it, and its author, ſo far as he may claim author-ſhip by it, what MONTESQUIEU ſaid of Harrington and his *Oceana*, of which the *Rota* is a kind of abridgment---"For want of knowing the nature of real "liberty, he buſied himſelf in purſuit of an imaginary one; "and he built a Chalcedon, though he had before his eyes "a Byzantium." To make way for this crude, wretched ſyſtem, our author would deſtroy the beſt, the moſt beautiful political fabric which the ſun ever beheld!

6. In fine. Let us, for a moment, imagine that an American republic is formed, every obſtacle having been ſurmounted; yet a very ſerious article ſtill remains to be enquired into, viz. the *expence* neceſſary to ſupport it. It behoves thoſe who have any property, to think of this part of the buſineſs. As for our author, it is more than probable he has nothing to loſe; and like others in the ſame predicament, is willing to truſt to the chapter of accidents and chances for ſomething in the ſcramble. He cannot loſe; but may poſſibly again. His own maxim is certainly true---"The more men have to loſe, the leſs willing are they to "venture*;" and *vice verſa*, ſay I.

It would be impoſſible to aſcertain, with preciſion, the expence that would be neceſſary for the ſupport of this New Republic. It would be very great undoubtedly---it would appear intolerable to the Americans, who have hitherto paid ſo few taxes. I ſhall juſt hint at a few articles.---

Our author aſſerts the neceſſity of our having a naval

* Common Senſe, *page* 71, *2d. edition.*

val force when independent. It is granted---we could not be without one. The reader, however, will not expect that I ſhould either adopt, or formally refute his hopeful ſcheme ---viz. That merchant ſhips, armed, ſhall be employed for our defence---that is to ſay---That ſhips, when on trading voyages to Europe, Africa, the Eaſt or Weſt Indies, or taking in their ladings at thoſe places, ſhall defend the trade and coaſts of America! "This, he ſays, would be uniting the "ſinews of commerce and defence, and making our ſtrength "and riches play into each others hands." The thought, I believe, is original, and the plan entirely his own---it might entitle him to a diſtinguiſhed ſeat among the ſage profeſſors of *Laputa*, who, according to SWIFT, were employed in "extracting ſun-beams out of cucumbers, calcining ice in-"to gun-powder, and making fire malleable," and other ſuch ingenious inventions.

This Gentleman thinks that, "50 or 60 ſhips, mount-"ing 20, 30, 40, or 50 guns, with a few guard-ſhips, "would keep up a ſufficient navy." Let us take a medium of the firſt of thoſe numbers, and ſuppoſe the American navy to conſiſt partly of *fifty-five* ſhips, each mounting 50 guns. The preciſe coſt of building a 50 gun ſhip in England, is £.14,355 ſterl. Fifty-five ſuch ſhips would coſt £.789,525 ſterling.

Beſides theſe, it would be neceſſary to have ſome larger ſhips; not only to act as "guardſhips," but to make our navy reſpectable, and without which it could not anſwer the intended purpoſe. Ships of 74 guns are reckoned the moſt ſerviceable; and the Britiſh navy has at this time no leſs than *forty-four* ſuch, that could be fitted for actual ſervice on the ſhorteſt notice; beſides about *ten* more of the ſame ſort, moſt of which could be got ready in a little time. The American navy would require at leaſt *thirty* of theſe, and our harbours in the middle and ſouthern colonies, would not conveniently admit larger ſhips. The coſt of building a 74 gun ſhip in England, is exactly £.27,200 ſterl. The coſt of 30 ſuch ſhips would be £716,000.

To the above ſhips it would be indiſpenſibly neceſſary to add ſome frigates, which are very uſeful in ſcouring the ſeas, and

and for various kinds of buſineſs where larger ſhips would be unwieldy, and not anſwer ſo well, Frigates of 32 guns, and 20 guns, are reckoned the moſt ſerviceable. *Twelve* of each ſort would be as few as our trade and coaſts would require. The coſt of building a 32 gun frigate is £.7480 ſterl. Twelve ſuch frigates would amount to £.89,760 ſterl. The building a 20 gun frigate coſts in England £.4370 ſterling; twelve ſuch frigates would amount to £.52,440 ſterling.

Cannon, ſmall-arms, ammunition, anchors, cables, &c. are all ſeparate articles from that of building; and are ſo expenſive, that a ſhip of war, when fitted for actual ſervice, with ſix months pay and proviſions, is generally reckoned to coſt one thouſand pounds ſterling for every gun. But as it would be difficult to aſcertain preciſely the expence of theſe--- or that of docks, arſenals, founderies, rope-walks, manufactories for ſail-cloth, &c. &c. all which are neceſſary towards keeping up a regular navy, I ſhall not enter into a minute detail of them; but take them by the groſs, and compute them at a third of the above coſt. Conſidering the high price of labour in America, this computation will be deemed very moderate.

Let us now caſt up thoſe ſeveral articles of expence.

Expence of building 55 ſhips of 50 guns each	£.789, 525
Ditto of building 30 ſhips of 74 guns each	716, 000
Ditto of building 12 frigates of 32 guns	89, 760
Ditto of building 12 frigates of 20 guns	52, 440
Total	£.1,647,725
One third of this for cannon and other articles above ſpecified - - -	£.542,575
Whole coſt of the navy - - -	£.2,190,300

This number of ſhips, amounting to *one hundred and nine*, is a very moderate navy indeed for this continent. The Britiſh navy with which we are to contend, conſiſts of *two hundred* and *twenty-four* ſhips, which may be fitted for ſea on the ſhorteſt notice; and of theſe, *twenty-one* carry from 80 to 100 guns. On the Britiſh liſt are upwards of 300 ſhips

ſhips, beſides thoſe building in the ſeveral dock-yards. The reader may reſt aſſured that my intelligence in the preceding article of coſt for conſtructing a navy, comes from the very beſt authority.

The annual expence is next to be conſidered. The certain, annual expence of a 50 gun ſhip in England, and for which proviſion is always made by government, is £.18,200 ſterl.---that of a 74 gun ſhip, is £.33,800 ſterl. of a 32 gun frigate, £.11,440 ſterl.---of a 20 gun frigate, £.8,320. This is allowed for wear and tare, victualling and wages. Repairs and expence of ammunition, are different articles; which, as they cannot be aſcertained, I ſhall paſs over. The certain annual expence of an American fleet, conſiſting of the above ſhips, would therefore be as follows------

Annual expence of 55 ſhips of 50 guns each -	£.1,001,000
Ditto of 30 ſhips of 74 guns - - - -	1,014,000
Ditto of 12 frigates of 32 guns - - - -	137,280
Ditto of 12 frigates of 20 guns - - - - -	99,840
Total,	£.2,252,120

It is not improbable that the American fleet might vary from this liſt, as to the number and ſize of the ſeveral ſhips, juſt as circumſtances might require: Yet certain I am, that in caſe we became independent of England, a fleet *equal* in force to the above, and attended with *equal* expence, would be indiſpenſibly neceſſary. If we are to have any foreign commerce, we muſt, like England, Holland, France, &c. keep ſhips of force in foreign parts, to protect that commerce; beſides thoſe which are neceſſary to defend our coaſts, harbours, and trade near home.

Conſidering our extenſive line of ſea-coaſt, and our no leſs extenſive frontiers, along which ſo many thouſands of ſavages are ſettled, I think America, when independent, cannot keep leſs than 30 regiments of infantry in conſtant pay, each regiment conſiſting of 700 men; the whole amounting to 21,000 men. The ſmall republic of Holland has an army of 40,000 men in time of peace. As matters are now circumſtanced throughout Chriſtendom, no ſtate can

preſerve its independency without a ſtanding army. The nation that would neglect to keep one, and a naval force, if it has any ſea coaſt, muſt infallibly fall a prey to ſome of its ambitious and more vigilant neighbours.

The annual expence of an Engliſh regiment, conſiſting of 700 men, is nearly £.15,743 ſterl: And the expence of raiſing, cloathing, and arming foot ſoldiers, is about £.6 a man; which will amount to £4,200 for a regiment of 700 men. Thus the annual expence of 30 regiments would be £.472,290 ſterl; and the charge of raiſing, arming, &c. would be £.126,000 ſterl. Moreover we ſhould find it neceſſary to have ſome regiments of cavalry, to be diſtributed in or near the large towns and cities. Let us ſuppoſe ſix regiments to be raiſed of 300 men each. The annual expence of an Engliſh regiment of dragoons, of 300 men, is nearly £.16,187 ſterl. The annual expence of ſix ſuch regiments would be £.97,122 ſterl; beſides the charge of horſes, arming, &c. which is computed at 30 guineas per man, and would amount to about £56,700 ſterl.

Let us now caſt up thoſe ſeveral ſums of annual expence.

Annual expence of the navy - - -	£.2,252,120
Ditto of 30 regiments of infantry - - -	472,290
Ditto of 6 regiments of cavalry - - - -	97,122
Total expence, naval and military -	£.2,821,532

The civil department ſtill remains; and after conſidering it with as much exactneſs as the nature of the caſe will admit ---after making an eſtimate of the ſalaries for Governors, Delegates, Judges, Ambaſſadors, Conſuls, and that almoſt endleſs train of officers in various departments, which will be unavoidable, as ſoon as we become Independent, and which coſt us nothing at preſent: The annual expence of America, when Independent, muſt greatly exceed THREE MILLIONS of pounds ſterling---it will probably amount to three millions and an half. However, to avoid fractions, let it be ſtated at three millions---even this ſum carries horror in the very idea of it; and yet many deluded people flatter themſelves that they will pay no taxes, if we are once Independent! Suppoſing then that Canada, Nova-Scotia, and Florida

Florida were joined to the thirteen colonies now united, the number would be ſixteen. The above ſum equally divided among them would be £.187,500 ſterl; which is nearly equal to 833,333 Spaniſh milled dollars, (reckoning a dollar at 4s. 6d. ſterl.) *annual* expence to each colony. But it ſhould be obſerved, that Rhode-Iſland is a ſmall colony---that the three little counties of Newcaſtle, Kent and Suſſex upon Delaware, are reckoned as a colony---that Nova-Scotia, Georgia and Florida are very young colonies: None of theſe therefore could poſſibly contribute an equal ſhare with the older and larger colonies; the expence of the latter muſt, of courſe, be proportionably greater, to make up the deficiency. Suppoſing the inhabitants of all theſe colonies amount to *three millions*---and I am of opinion their number is not greater---each individual, man, woman, and child, black and white, would have *twenty ſhillings* ſterling, i. e. above four Spaniſh dollars to pay *annually* for defraying the public expence. Or, taking every ſeventh perſon for a Taxable, which I think is near the uſual proportion, and that this ſum were to be paid by a Poll-tax, then every Taxable in the colonies muſt pay £.7 ſterl. i. e. about 32 Spaniſh dollars *annually* for the public expence, over and above what he has paid in times paſt. In caſe of war or any extraordinary emergency, thoſe taxes muſt riſe proportionably.

Beſides this annual expence, there is an immenſe ſum for conſtructing a navy and raiſing an army——

For conſtructing a navy - - - - -	£.2,190,300
For raiſing, arming, &c. 30 regim. of Infantry	126,000
For raiſing, arming, &c. 6 regim. of Cavalry -	56,700
Total,	£.2,373,000

This ſum o two millions, three hundred and ſeventy-three thouſand pounds ſterling, joined to the ſixteen millions of dollars, which I am informed the Honourable Congreſs has been obliged already to iſſue, beſides as much more perhaps which they will find neceſſary to iſſue for the ſupport of the war, if it continues, and the prodigious ſums of paper currency which the ſeveral colonies have ſtruck, and muſt here-

after ſtrike; will make a load of debt, that muſt prove ruinous to this continent.

I have not knowingly exaggerated a ſingle article in the above eſtimate; and were the trial made, I verily believe the expence would be found much greater. For I have formed this eſtimate according to the ſtate of things in England; but it is well known that wages and the price of labour in general, are much higher in America than in England. Labour muſt neceſſarily be dear in every country where land is cheap, and large tracts of it unſettled, as is the caſe here. Hence an American regiment coſts us *double* what a Britiſh regiment, of equal number, coſts Britain. Were it proper to be explicit, and deſcend to particulars, I could evince this paſt all poſſibility of doubt; and I appeal for the truth of it to thoſe gentlemen among us who are acquainted with theſe matters.

Where the money is to come from which will defray this enormous annual expence of *three millions*, ſterling, and all thoſe other debts, I know not; unleſs the author of *Common Senſe*, or ſome other ingenious projector, can diſcover the *Philoſopher's Stone*, by which iron and other baſe metals may be tranſmuted into gold. Certain I am, that our commerce and agriculture, the two principal ſources of our wealth, will not ſupport ſuch an expence. The whole of our exports from the Thirteen United Colonies in the year 1769, amounted only to £.2,887,898 ſterl.*; which is not ſo much, by near half a million, as our annual expence would be, were we Independent of Great-Britain. Thoſe exports, with no inconſiderable part of the profits ariſing from them, it is well known, centered finally in Britain, to pay the merchants and manufacturers there for goods we had imported thence; and yet left us ſtill in debt! What then muſt our ſituation be, or what the ſtate of our trade, when oppreſſed with ſuch a burthen of annual expence! When every article of commerce, every neceſſary of life, together with our lands, muſt be heavily taxed, to defray that expence!

Such is the load of debt and expence we ſhould incur by this Writer's hopeful exchange of our connection with Great Britain,

* See *Campbell's Political Survey of Great-Britain*, vol. 2.

Britain for Independency and Republicaniſm! And all this, after being exhauſted by a tedious war, and perhaps our ſhipping and ſea-ports deſtroyed! This is a very ſerious matter; which is obvious to every underſtanding, and which no ſophiſtry can evade. All who have any prudence or common ſenſe left, or any property to loſe, will pauſe and conſider well, before th .y plunge themſelves into ſuch a dreadful ſituation. How little do thoſe who deſire this ſituation, know what they are about, or what they deſire.

Our author frequently refers us to Holland, as if that were the only land of liberty---crowned with every bleſſing, and exempt from every evil. But hear a little plain truth. The national debt of Holland is much greater, in proportion, than that of England. The taxes in Holland far exceed not only thoſe in England, but even thoſe in France, inſomuch that a certain writer declares he ſcarcely knows any thing they have which has eſcaped taxation, "except the air they breathe". Nay more,---the people at large have no voice in chuſing the members of their ſeveral Senates, as we have in chuſing Repreſentatives. The members of each Senate, upon any vacancy, elect new members; and the deputies from thoſe Senates, conſtitute the *States General.* So that in fact, the people have no ſhare in the government, as with us; "they have nothing to do but pay and grumble," as Lord Cheſterfield obſerves. Yet this is the country our author holds up for imitation; and if we were to follow his advice, I have not the leaſt doubt but we ſhould ſoon reſemble them in paying heavy taxes, as well as in every other matter.

But here it may be ſaid---*That all the evils above ſpecified, are more tolerable than ſlavery.* With this ſentiment I ſincerely agree---any hardſhips, however great, are preferable to ſlavery. But then I aſk, is there no other alternative in the preſent caſe? Is there no choice left us but ſlavery, or thoſe evils? I am confident there is; and that both may be equally avoided? Let us only ſhew a diſpoſition to treat or negociate in earneſt---let us fall upon ſome method to ſet a treaty or negociation with Great Britain on foot; and if once properly begun, there is a moral certainty that this unhappy

happy diſpute will be ſettled to the mutual ſatisfaction and intereſt of both countries. For my part, I have not the leaſt doubt about it.

It would be improper and needleſs for me to enlarge on the particulars that ſhould be adjuſted at ſuch a treaty. The matureſt deliberation will be neceſſary on the occaſion, as well as a generous regard to every part of the Empire. I ſhall juſt beg leave to ſuggeſt my opinion on a few points--- I think America ſhould inſiſt, that the claim of parliamentary taxation be either explicitly relinquiſhed; or elſe, ſuch ſecurity given as the caſe will admit, and may be equivalent to a formal relinquiſhment, that this claim ſhall not be exerted. When this moſt important point is gained, America ſhould conſider, that there is a great difference between having her money wreſted from her by others, and not giving any of it herſelf, when it is proper to give. While ſhe is protected, and ſhares in the advantages reſulting from being a part of the Britiſh Empire, ſhe ſhould contribute ſomething for that protection and thoſe advantages; and I never heard a ſenſible American deny this. Moreover, ſhe ſhould ſtipulate for ſuch a freedom of trade as is conſiſtent with the general welfare of the State; and that this intereſting object be ſettled in ſuch a manner as to preclude, as much as poſſible, any impolitic, or injurious infringements hereafter. All this may be eaſily done, if both ſides are only diſpoſed for peace; and there are many other particulars which would be exceedingly beneficial to America, and might be obtained, as they could not interfere with the intereſt of Great Britain or any other part of the empire. We have abundant proof of this as well as ſeveral good hints to proceed on, in the late conceſſions to Nova-Scotia from government.

But it may be aſked---what probability is there that Britain will enter on ſuch a treaty, or liſten to propoſals of this kind? Is ſhe not preparing for war, and fitting out a formidable armament againſt the colonies? I anſwer---there is every reaſon to believe that ſhe will enter on ſuch a treaty, if it is deſired; and that ſhe will liſten to reaſonable propoſals. It is her intereſt to do ſo. To hold theſe colonies

by

by the ſword only, were ſhe ever ſo powerful, would be holding them by a very precarious, expenſive tenure. Such a Union with the Colonies as will promote their intereſt equally with her's, is the only effectual way of attaching them to her. Is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that Great Britain does not ſee this? Or that ſhe is not ſenſible of it? Beſides, it has been openly and expreſsly declared in Parliament that *taxation is given up* by the Miniſtry; we are alſo aſſured that ſome very reſpectable names have been lately added to the advocates of America; and Commiſſioners have been appointed to treat with us. All theſe things are in our favour, and promiſe a proſperous iſſue to a negociation, if once begun. The Britiſh armament will not in the leaſt impede a treaty. Belligerent-Powers, when on the eve of peace, always make as vigorous preparations for war, as if there were no thoughts of peace. America alſo is preparing for war, which is no more than a prudent ſtep. It need not prevent her from treating; and ſhe may thereby obtain better terms.

But a Declaration for Independency on the part of America, would preclude treaty intirely; and could anſwer no good purpoſe. We actually have already every advantage of Independency, without its inconveniences. By a Declaration of Independency, we ſhould inſtantly loſe all aſſiſtance from our friends in England. It would ſtop their mouths; for were they to ſay any thing in our favour, they would be deemed rebels, and treated accordingly.

Our author is much elated with the proſpect of foreign ſuccour, if we once declare ourſelves Independent; and from thence promiſeth us mighty matters. This, no doubt, is intended to ſpirit up the deſponding---all who might ſhrink at the thought of America encountering, ſingly and unſupported, the whole ſtrength of Great-Britain. I believe in my conſcience, that he is as much miſtaken in this, as in any thing elſe; and that this expectation is deluſive, vain and fallacious. My reaſons are theſe, and I ſubmit them to the readers judgement.

The only European power from which we can poſſibly receive aſſiſtance, is France. But France is now at peace with Great-Britain; and is it probable that France would interrupt that peace, and hazard a war with the power which lately

reduced

reduced her ſo low, from a *diſintereſted* motive of aiding and protecting theſe Colonies? The fate of Corſica may teach us how *ready* European ſtates are to act on *diſintereſted* motives, in ſuch caſes. France has now a pacific King; her finances are in a very ruinous ſtate; both which circumſtances will naturally tend to keep her quiet. If it be ſaid---That the excluſive trade of America would be a ſufficient inducement for France to engage on our ſide---I anſwer---That ſhe never can have our excluſive trade, till the power of Great-Britain is totally annihilated. Now, ſuppoſing France were able to effect this---(a ſuppoſition not very probable)---yet the other European ſtates are too jealous of her---too deeply intereſted in preſerving a due ballance of power, which is a principal object in European politics, ever to ſuffer ſuch an event to take place.

It is well known that ſome of the French and Spaniſh Coloniſts, not long ſince, offered to put themſelves under the protection of England, and declare themſelves Independent of France and Spain; but England rejected both offers. The example would be rather dangerous to ſtates that have colonies---to none could it be more ſo than to France and Spain, who have ſo many and ſuch extenſive colonies. "The "practice of courts are as much againſt us" in this, as in the inſtance our author mentions. Can any one imagine, that becauſe we declared ourſelves Independent of England, France would *therefore* conſider us as really Independent! And before England had acquieſced, or made any effort worth mentioning to reduce us? Or can any one be ſo weak as to think, that France would run the riſque of a war with England, unleſs ſhe (France) were ſure of ſome extraordinary advantage by it, in having the colonies under her *immediate juriſdiction?* If England will not protect us for our trade, ſurely France will not.

But I have ſome *facts* to alledge further on this head, which will have great weight with all ſober, diſpaſſionate perſons. As for thoſe who give themſelves up to paſſion and prejudice, they are ſcarcely capable of judging. Like men who are drawn in and whirled about, by ſome impetuous vortex, they have loſt the proper command of themſelves.

The

The ſeveral European ſtates who have colonies on this continent, or the adjacent iſlands, are exceedingly jealous of thoſe colonies, leſt they ſhould aſpire to Independency. He muſt be totally ignorant of the ſtate of things in Europe who is not ſenſible of this. The great diſtance of America from Europe contributes to raiſe that jealouſy; and it is heightened by our growing ſtrength and importance, and our enterprizing ſpirit. Hence it was that France lately ſent ſuch a number of regular troops to Martinico; and diſarmed all the inhabitants, to whom the defence of that iſland was chiefly committed formerly. The profeſſed reaſon for diſarming the inhabitants was to prevent their joining the North Americans in their conteſt with Great-Britain. This information comes from a gentleman who was then at Martinico, and lately arrived on this continent. The inhabitants of the French Weſt-Indies, it is probable, would willingly join us, and ſhake off the deſpotic yoke under which they groan; but this diſpoſition in them will only ſerve to alarm France the more, and induce the latter to oppoſe, rather than aſſiſt us.

Diſcountenancing *our* independency by France, would only be ſuch a return as Britain will naturally expect, and moſt probably receive, for a ſimilar conduct in her to the French inhabitants of Hiſpaniola. Not long after the concluſion of the late war, thoſe inhabitants were driven by the moſt glaring oppreſſion, to take up arms. The French Governor applied for aſſiſtance to the Engliſh Admiral, then on the Weſt-India ſtation. Several ſhips were ſent immediately by the latter, with the promiſe of more, if neceſſary. The inſurrection was quelled by the Governor's inſidiouſly drawing the leaders of the inſurrection into a treaty, and then making priſoners of them---a circumſtance not very inviting to place much faith in French promiſes or generoſity.

The King of Denmark's late proclamation, in which he declares, that *the eſtates of ſuch of his ſubjects as ſhall join the Americans, will be forfeited*, is a further proof of the diſpoſition of European powers, who have ſettlements in America.

Let any man calmly reflect on theſe particulars; and then judge whether it is probable that France or any other Euro-

pean ſtate that has profeſſions on this quarter of the globe, will contribute to erect an independent empire in America; eſpecially when it is conſidered, that this new empire, from its proximity, muſt, ſooner or later, infallibly ſwallow up thoſe poſſeſſions. I am firmly of opinion, that our Declaration of Independency will have an effect directly contrary to what our author ſuggeſts, and what ſome warm people expect. I think it infinitely more likely that it will produce a coalition or treaty between the ſeveral European nations, who have ſettlements in America, to guarantee and ſecure their reſpective ſettlements to each other; than that any of theſe nations will co-operate with our deſign, and thereby lend a hand to injure themſelves.

Nay, further; I can whiſper a ſecret to the author of *Common Senſe*, provided he will let it go no further---which is---That France and Spain have *actually made an offer of their aſſiſtance* to Great-Britain, in the preſent conteſt with the Colonies. This intelligence comes from ſuch authority as would remove all doubt about the matter, even from our zealous Republican, were I at liberty to mention that authority.

Indeed were France ever ſo willing and able to aſſiſt us, the experiment would be imprudent in us, and hazardous to the higheſt degree. There is ſcarcely an inſtance recorded in hiſtory of Foreigners being called in to aſſiſt in domeſtic quarrels, that it did not prove ruinous to thoſe that ſought their aid. The ancient Britons invited the Saxons to aſſiſt them againſt the Picts---the Picts were ſubdued; and the Britons enſlaved. One inſtance more I cannot forbear mentioning. The Etolians and other Greek ſtates called in the Romans to aſſiſt them againſt Philip of Macedon, one of Alexander's Succeſſors. Philip was reduced; and the Roman yoke was impoſed on the Grecian ſtates. Senſible of their error, when it was too late, and anxious for deliverance from the Romans, the Etolians applied for Aid to Antiochus, who then poſſeſſed the remains of Alexander's Aſiatic Dominions. The Romans now employed Philip to ſubdue Antiochus and the Etolians, as before they had employed the Etolians to ſubdue Philip. The

Roman

Roman yoke was more confirmed and made heavier. Were we to call in France on this occaſion; and ſhould our united force ſucceed againſt Britain, ſomething ſimilar to this would probably follow.

I have heard the caſe of Holland's revolt from Spain, and Queen Elizabeth's affording aid to the former, mentioned as parallel to ours. But inſtead of being parallel, the caſes differ in every circumſtance. Elizabeth, embarraſſed greatly by Roman Catholics at home, was then at war with Philip IId. of Spain---a cruel, gloomy tyrant, who had lately introduced the inquiſition into the low countries, where hundreds of his proteſtant ſubjects were ſacrificed by that bloody court. This was the real cauſe of the Dutch revolt; though civil matters partly mingled with it. Elizabeth by aſſiſting the Dutch, ſerved two important purpoſes. One was to protect the proteſtants who were every where threatned with deſtruction. The other was, to diſtreſs her implacable enemy, who aimed at no leſs than the utter ruin of her religion, crown and kingdom. The Dutch ſtates offered Elizabeth the ſovereignty of their country; but ſhe refuſed it, having no deſign of that ſort. It is more than probable the French King would not be ſo diſintereſted, modeſt and ſelf-denying as Elizabeth was, were we to make him the like offer. Such was the caſe of Holland; yet ſome have been ſo ſilly as to compare our preſent caſe with that of the Dutch.

Conſider this matter as you will, view the Declaration of Independency in what light you pleaſe; the ruin of America muſt be the inevitable conſequence. Our author's earneſtneſs and zeal therefore, that we ſhould declare ourſelves Independent, ſerves only to prove that he himſelf is deſperate; and that he would gladly bring this whole continent into the ſame ſituation.

But our author repeatedly tells us---" That to expend ſo " many millions for the ſake of getting a few vile acts re- " pealed, is unworthy of the charge." Now to paſs over the groſs inſult here offered to the Continental Congreſs, who had this important object principally in view, in the ſpirited meaſures they have taken: I anſwer---That if five times as many millions had been expended, America would be an

immenſe gainer, provided thoſe acts are repealed, and her liberties, property, and trade, are ſettled on a firm baſis, by a Conſtitutional Union with Great-Britain. Were that meaſure once effected, the peace and proſperity of this continent would be as immutably and certainly ſecure as any thing in this world can. We ſhould be the happieſt people in the world. The Americans have fully evinced, to the conviction of the moſt incredulous, that they have an high ſenſe of their liberties, and ſufficient ſpirit to vindicate thoſe liberties. Their numbers, ſtrength, and importance, will be daily increaſing; theſe will command reſpect from Great-Britain, and inſure to them a mild and equitable treatment from her. She will not hereafter be over anxious to contend, or come to blows with them. This I think is clear to demonſtration; and hence we may learn to ſet a proper value on the rant which this author throws out, as if America would be perpetually embroiled with England hereafter, unleſs we declare for independency.

For my part, I look upon this pamphlet to be the moſt injurious, in every reſpect, to America, of any that has appeared ſince theſe troubles began. Its natural and neceſſary tendency is, to produce jealouſy, diſſention and diſunion among us. The Continental Congreſs, the ſeveral Provincial Congreſſes and Aſſemblies, have all unanimouſly and in the ſtrongeſt terms, diſclaimed every idea of Independency. They have repeatedly declared their abhorrence of ſuch a ſtep; they have as often declared their firm attachment to our Sovereign and the Parent State. They have declared that placing them in the ſame ſituation that they were at the cloſe of the laſt war, was their only object; that when this was done, by repealing the obnoxious acts, our former harmony and friendſhip would be reſtored. I appeal to the reader whether all this has not been done from one end of the continent to the other.

Yet here ſteps forth a writer, who avers with as much aſſurance as if he had the whole continent at his back, and ready to ſupport his aſſeverations---That Independency is our duty and intereſt---That it was folly and raſhneſs to go to the expence we have been at for the ſake of repealing thoſe obnoxious

obnoxious acts; and moreover, loads with the moſt opprobrious terms, that Sovereign and Nation to which we had declared our attachment! In what light can this be viewed in Britain? Muſt it not weaken the influence of our friends---ſtrengthen the hands of the miniſtry---and give weight to every thing our enemies have ſaid to our diſadvantage? Muſt it not induce people to ſuſpect our candour---that all our declarations were inſincere, fallacious---intended only to amuſe and deceive?---It is as much to vindicate my injured countrymen from this diſgrace, which they deſerve not, as to oppoſe the deſtructive project of Independency, that I appear on this occaſion---a project which is as *new* as it is deſtructive.

I have now conſidered every thing in this Incendiary's pamphlet, that deſerves notice. If ſome things are paſſed over, it is not becauſe they are unanſwerable; but becauſe they are not worthy of an anſwer. I have on purpoſe omitted every ſubject, the diſcuſſion of which might tend to raiſe jealouſy among the coloniſts; ſuch as religion, the claims of ſome colonies on others, beſides many more of the ſame kind. But it was more difficult to avoid ſpeaking of theſe, than to point out what prolific ſources of animoſity, bitterneſs and bloody conteſts they muſt infallibly prove, were America to become independent. The whole is freely ſubmitted to the reader's candid, diſpaſſionate judgment.

The Author of *Common Senſe* may probably call me "a "diſguiſed tory, a prejudiced man," or what in his eſtimation "will be productive of more calamities to this continent than "all others---a moderate man." But I am too conſcious of the ſincerity of my own heart, and of the rectitude of my intentions, to pay any regard to whatever he is pleaſed to call me. Who indeed would be ambitious of his approbation, when he expreſsly reprobates Moderation---that offſpring of true wiſdom and ſound judgment? The welfare of America is what I wiſh for above any earthly thing. I am fully, firmly and conſcientiouſly perſuaded, that our author's ſcheme of Independency and Republicaniſm, is big with ruin---with inevitable ruin to America. Againſt this ſcheme therefore, which totally changes the ground we ſet

out

out on, as an honeſt man, as a friend to human nature, I muſt and will bear teſtimony.

Let the ſpirit, deſign and motives which are undeniably evident in our reſpective pamphlets, decide which ſhould be attended to moſt.

The author of *Common Senſe* is a violent ſtickler for Democracy or Republicaniſm only---every other ſpecies of government is reprobated by him as tyrannical: *I* plead for that conſtitution which has been formed by the wiſdom of ages---is the admiration of mankind---is beſt-adapted to the genius of Britons, and is moſt friendly to liberty.

He takes pleaſure in aggravating every circumſtance of our unhappy diſpute---would inſpire others with the ſame rage that inſtigates himſelf, and would ſet his fellow ſubjects to cutting each others throats. *I* would moſt gladly, were it in my power, draw a veil of eternal oblivion over any errors which Great Britain or the colonies may have fallen into---I would willingly perſuade them to mutual harmony and union; ſince on theſe their mutual happineſs and intereſt depend.

He is evidently goaded on by ambition and reſentment, to ſeek for the gratification of thoſe paſſions in an independent republic here; which would reduce America to the ſame deſperate ſtate with himſelf: *I* have no intereſt to ſerve but what is common to my countrymen---but what every American of property is concerned in equally with me.

He places himſelf at the head of a party; and ſpurns from him with the utmoſt contempt and indignation, all who will not enliſt under his banner: *I* am of no party, but ſo far as the welfare of America is aimed at; and I believe there are many who aim at this in every party. I have not learnt to pace with ſuch intire acquieſcence in the trammels of any party, as not to deſert it, the moment it deſerts the intereſt of my country.

He recommends a new, untried romantic ſcheme, at which we would at firſt have ſhuddered---which is big with inevitable ruin, and is the laſt ſtage of political phrenzy. *I* am for purſuing the ſame object, and acting on the ſame principles and plan with which we ſet out, when this conteſt began, and of whoſe ſucceſs there is a moral certainty. This,

This, as far as I can know or ſee, is the true ſtate of our caſe---let Heaven and Earth judge between us.

America is far from being yet in a deſperate ſituation. I am confident ſhe may obtain honourable and advantagious terms from Great Britain. A few years of peace will ſoon retrieve all her loſſes. She will rapidly advance to a ſtate of maturity, whereby ſhe may not only repay the parent ſtate amply for all paſt benefits; but alſo lay under the greateſt obligations. America, till very lately, has been the happieſt country in the univerſe. Bleſt with all that nature could beſtow with the profuſeſt bounty, ſhe enjoyed beſides, more liberty, greater privileges than any other land. How painful is it to reflect on theſe things, and to look forward to the gloomy proſpects now before us! But it is not too late to hope that matters may mend. By prudent management her former happineſs may again return; and continue to encreaſe for ages to come, in a union with the parent ſtate.

However diſtant humanity may wiſh the period; yet, in the rotation of human affairs, a period may arrive, when, (both countries being prepared for it) ſome terrible diſaſter, ſome dreadful convulſion in Great Britain, may transfer the ſeat of empire to this weſtern hemiſphere---where the Britiſh conſtitution, like the Phœnix from its parent's aſhes, ſhall riſe with youthful vigour and ſhine with redoubled ſplendor.

But if America ſhould now miſtake her real intereſt---if her ſons, infatuated with romantic notions of conqueſt and empire, ere things are ripe, ſhould adopt this republican's ſcheme: They will infallibly deſtroy this ſmiling proſpect. They will diſmember this happy country---make it a ſcene of blood and ſlaughter, and entail wretchedneſs and miſery on millions yet unborn.

Quod Deus a nobis procul avertat.

F I N I S.

BRITISH
13 JA 1911
MUSEUM